

12/5

G77G62

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 020 646 272 3

PHOTOFILE ENVELOPES

MADE FROM

PERMALIFE® PAPER

COPYRITE HOWARD PAPER MILLS INC

CT 275

.G77

G62

Copy 1

A

REJOINDER

TO THE

REPLY

ON THE

KENT'S HILL TRAGEDY.

BY

JONAS GREENE.

LEWISTON:

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR.

1868.

64314

Ms. 16-16
ET 275
G 77662
m.v.g.

REJOINDER.

THIS Dr. Torsey, whom I have arraigned before the bar of the public as doing, under prejudice, great wrong to my child, is the motive power which runs that Institution on Kent's Hill. He does not meet me openly before the public and answer my complaints against him, but takes shelter behind the Trustees. While, nominally, this committee of three, of the Trustees, make the Reply, yet I know enough about lawyers and their ministers being employed in the work, to believe that it is the combined effort of this Faculty and Trustees, with the aid of many of their ministers and leading men through the State. Would it not have appeared more manly for that Faculty to have made their own defence? But this is Dr. T. style — to keep his own paws out of the fire as long as he can, so that he can say, "I have not done this, that, or the other thing."

This committee in their reply say: "The Trustees have twice sought to have a fair and thorough investigation, in the presence and with the concurrence of Mr. Greene, for the purpose of determining in a satisfactory manner whether the teachers or any other person is culpable." Their first attempt to investigate this affair is fully explained in the "Crown Won" — on pages 132 to 136. See my objections there in full.

"But as the proposal was declined by Mr. Greene, on the ground that the committee was appointed by the trustees from their own members, the plan was abandoned."

I now desire the reader and parent to note carefully their record as given in their reply — which record I had seen before I published my book.

"Copy from Record of Trustees, Annual Meeting, June 5, 1867. — In accordance with a request of Dr. Torsey, it was voted to make a thorough investigation of the administration of the Faculty in the case of Miss M. Louise Greene, now deceased. (Messrs. Torsey and Robinson being both excused from acting in the investigation, at

their own request, and A. P. Morrill appointed chairman and J. J. Perry secretary). To this end, witnesses were examined at length, after which the subject was quite fully discussed by different members of the Board. Rev. S. Allen then offered the following preamble and resolution :

“Whereas, certain reports have been published and industriously circulated during the past year, in which the administration of the school, and particularly the conduct of Rev. H. P. Torsey, the President, in the case of the late Miss M. Louise Greene, has been severely censured, although no complaints have been made to the Trustees, by the parties professing to have been aggrieved; and whereas, such reports are damaging in their tendency, and are calculated to mislead the public mind; therefore,

“*Resolved*—First: That after a careful and patient hearing of the facts of the case, the Trustees find no ground for censure against H. P. Torsey, or any other person concerned in the management of the Institution, in the case of the late Miss M. Louise Greene; that so far from having been “expelled,” Miss Greene left the Institution of her own accord, without the knowledge of the teachers, and before the Faculty had taken action in her case; and that in the judgment of the Trustees, the course pursued in the sad case was extremely lenient and kind.

“*Resolved*—Second: That the Trustees still have undiminished confidence in the ability and kindly disposition of Rev. H. P. Torsey, in the discharge of the difficult and responsible duties of the station he has filled for twenty-three years with success unsurpassed by that of any other teacher within our knowledge.

“*Resolved*—Third: That the M. W. Seminary and Female College was never more deserving of the confidence of the public than at the present time; and that the continued prosperity of the school, notwithstanding the damaging reports above referred to, is a gratifying popular endorsement of the administration of the Institution.

“Attest: JOHN J. PERRY, *Secretary pro tem.*”

In their Reply they go on to say that, “During the session Mr. Torsey informed the Trustees that he desired them to investigate his administration, in the case of Miss Greene. Accordingly, an evening session was agreed upon for this purpose; and Mr. Knight, who was still in the neighborhood, was invited to be present. He accordingly came in, and remained till the close of the investigation, at a

late hour of the night." See on page 135, "Crown Won," more about this investigation. Mr. Knight now tells me that it was about seven o'clock when the Trustees went into session, and that an hour, at least, was spent in attending to other business—about the purchase or sale of real estate connected with the Institution, and the taxes on some wood land which they thought they ought not to pay. Between ten and eleven, Mr. K. says, this "careful and patient hearing of the facts in the case"—the words in their preamble—this investigation closed, which was about an hour before the exercises in the chapel broke up—two and a-half or three hours given to this investigation, from which they made the aforesaid record, in which they say the Trustees find no ground for censure against H. P. Torsey or any other person concerned in the management of the Institution.

MR. KNIGHT'S STATEMENT.

On the morning of the sixth of June, 1867, Miss Mira I. Reed stated to me that Dr. Torsey having ascertained that she had received a letter from Mr. Greene, came to her boarding place and desired to see it; and then with her consent carried it away. And I positively deny that I was in any way employed to prevent Miss Reed from testifying in the case of Miss Greene, in the hearing before the Trustees; and I also stated that no blame could be attached to the teachers, according to the testimony then and there given.

Peru, March 21, 1868.

A. M. KNIGHT.

They suppress, in the Reply, the last eight words of Mr. Knight as above, which greatly misrepresents him and deceives the public.

See at the bottom of page 131, "Crown Won," what was published in the papers in regard to this pretended thorough investigation, in June, 1866, in several journals of this State. The reader can now see where these published accounts came from, and the way Dr. T. and the Faculty were cleared from all blame. The careful and patient investigation, of one whole short evening in June—a wonderful length of time to hear the evidence, discuss this sad case, and make out the preamble and the resolves!—to make up their deliberate, sound judgment, and put on record, there to remain for all time, this wonderful decision and wicked statement, that no complaint had been made to the Trustees by the parties professing to have been aggrieved! (See preamble before the resolves.) Why

this bitter complaint of Torsey, and my letter to Robinson, two of the Trustees, if no complaint had been made by us to them? With the publication of that pretended investigation of that committee of students, May 6, 1867 (see "Crown Won," pages 127-8-9, for full explanations,—with this record, published to the world, exonerating the faculty from all blame, and the difficulty I encountered to get my statements before the public, as explained on page 144, "Crown Won"—with all their efforts to blame Louise, and to clear all those who dealt with her from blame—I would ask any parent, What less would you have done under like circumstances than to publish such a book? Please answer this question satisfactorily to yourselves before you condemn me. When all this had gone before the public—the result of those *ex-parte* investigations—and I had replied through my book, then they show for the first time some signs of fairness, when on the 14th of November, 1867, the trustees at a meeting held at Lewiston authorize William Deering, of Portland, one of the trustees, to write me to join them in a reference, who wrote me, Nov. 15, 1867, and appended the following resolve, passed at the said trustees' meeting:

"*Resolved*—That William Deering, of Portland, be authorized to present to Mr. Greene the following proposition, viz: that Hons. W. Davis, E. Shepley, W. G. Barrows, or such other disinterested persons as may be agreed upon, be requested to nominate a reference, consisting of disinterested and honorable legal gentlemen, to whom the whole matter, together with all the testimony and facts in the case, may be referred, and whose decision in the case shall be final, and whose opinion, together with the testimony, shall be laid before the community in such a manner as said reference may determine."

To this I replied, November 20, 1867, as follows:

"MR. DEERING,—Dear Sir,—Yours of the 15th inst. came to hand last evening, and in reply permit me to say that as you (the trustees) have put on record in the book containing the records of the Institution, what purports to be a thorough investigation of the circumstances and death of my daughter, the substance of the same having been published to the world, from which decision I have appealed to the public and to the Ruler of the Universe for the justice of my course, by the decision of an intelligent public and the Judge of All I am willing to stand or fall. And, sir, were this your

case, your child, how much less would you have been likely to have said than I have, in a case so sad, if it was clear to your mind that it was prejudice that destroyed your child. Your proposition is respectfully declined.

Yours, respectfully,

JONAS GREENE."

The public may judge how I must feel about this show of fairness at this late day, after all I have showed had been done to try to clear this Faculty, and to disgrace the memory of Louise. See what has been attempted and done, as shown on pages 88-94, "Crown Won." It did seem to me to be too late, and they had gone too far in spreading their misrepresentations over the State against the deceased. I and the good people of the State may judge what is meant in that resolve by "honorable legal gentlemen, to whom the whole matter may be referred." The public will, with all the twisting, turning and maneuvering of this Faculty, and some of the Trustees, in pursuing me at Lewiston, while there for the remains of my child—see pages 130-31, "Crown Won"—and their persistent efforts to circumscribe my influence, to annoy and perplex me. What satisfaction I should have received from such a reference I am unable to judge. Have all the claims of justice and humanity, the moral and religious obligations, fled from the managers of this Institution? Are there no responsibilities resting upon them but legal ones in this sad case?

Now comes in the Reply, the affidavit of Torsey; and if I had nothing but the conversation we had with him, and others of the Faculty, and those who surround him, to rely upon in my defence, against him whom I believe to be unscrupulous, I should despair of getting him to admit one single thing which he said or did with Louise, or said to us, which makes against him. But, thanks to an over-ruling Providence, who in a measure holds the destinies of us all in his hands, I have enough of his and her written statements, which I think will satisfy the public that all of his sworn statements in the Reply cannot be true. The reader can see in the "Crown Won," pp. 22-27, the whole explanation of his denial to let her go home with Mary Chapman, in August, 1864. See all of the correspondence between her and myself, between myself and Torsey; and when I wrote him she would leave his school unless some reconciliation could be had, he was in a place where, if he had any good reason for refusing her, and he had anything against her for viola-

tions of rules or any bad conduct, he would have made use of it and given it to me in excuse for his rude conduct to her. In that long letter of Louise in August, 1864, giving a particular account of this affair, she says, "Preserve this letter, and if you doubt any part of it I am willing to read it myself before you to Dr. Torsey. It is only to-night that I saw him, and I've taken particular pains to write down what was said, as near as possible, word for word." And now when I give quotations from Dr. Torsey's sworn statement in the Reply, which contradict Louise's statements in this letter, which I shall give word for word in quotations to disprove his statement, the public may judge, under all the circumstances, whether his recollection, after the lapse of four and a-half years, is more reliable as to what was said and done, when it is for his selfish interest to tell it as he chooses, than her's, which was written in the very hour in which it transpired, to her parents, with the assurance that she would read it to them in the presence of Torsey.

From Torsey's affidavit—"At the time Miss Greene met me on the Seminary grounds, and desired permission to leave the Hill and spend the night and the next day with Mary Chapman, I asked her if she had a permit from her father. She said she had not."

From Louise's letter—"So when she came I went to Dr. Torsey for leave to go home with her, carrying the general permission you had given me, and on the strength of which he had heretofore granted my request."

He (Torsey) says—"A short time afterwards she met me again on the street, and again importuned me."

She (Louise) gives a minute and particular history of her asking him, when, where, and all about it, and says, "all this occupied about three minutes; we were talking on the sidewalk." Here is the length and only time she importuned him (as shown by this letter written at the time), except the second time, at his house. She says she made the request to him once on the sidewalk, and stopped about three minutes, and then went to Miss Robinson, and in about a half-hour again went to his house.

Torsey says in his affidavit—"This refusal of favors referred exclusively to her going to Mr. Chapman's, and was not on account of any difficulty between Mr. C. and myself, for we were on the most friendly terms, but because she had been there three times without permission."

August 29, 1864, Dr. T. wrote me and said, "Once I gave per-

mission to Louise to go to the Corner to visit, and once she went *without* permission. Last Friday she asked to go again and spend the night. I told her we should give fewer leaves of absence this term; and after I had retired for the night she came again. I answered her in the same manner and in the same words as before."

Now I submit those two statements to the public—one written to me at the time, when he would have availed himself of any excuse or reason possible against Louise. He then put her offence, only once of going to the Corner without leave. (See on page 26, "Crown Won," how this is explained.) Now he swears it was three times. He then says nothing about his neuralgic pain in his eyes and head; now he would seem to make that as an excuse. If all was so smooth and pleasant with Mr. Chapman, then why did Mary leave his school? Mr. Chapman has once given me a different version of this affair.

She says in this long letter, "I was advised to go home with Mary C., but thought it not best." For the truth of this statement I will say that on the 7th of November, 1866, Mary Chapman told me and my wife that she advised her to go, and said she ought to have gone.

I am willing to put Louise's record, made the very day of the conversation in Miss Robinson's room, April 11, 1865 (see pp. 28-9 of "Crown Won"), against Torsey's statement, made from recollection, in 1868, in the Reply. Read both, and judge which is true.

Again Torsey says—"The Monday evening before Louise left, Miss Case called on me and informed me that Miss Greene had been taking articles of clothing not belonging to her, and that Mrs. Daggett and herself were investigating the matter. I requested her to do it quietly, and to say nothing to any one about the matter. I had also learned Miss Greene had taken money." Mark well, that Torsey has here *sworn* that on Monday evening, which was the 21st of May, before any investigation was had, and before Miss Case and Mrs. Daggett had been into Louise's room at all, to see what they could find, and before any one had accused Louise of taking the money,—for it is known to everybody there and elsewhere who knows anything about her confession, which was on Tuesday, the 22d, that she made that confession, not to Dr. Torsey, but to Mr. Daggett and his wife and Miss Case, and Torsey could not have known anything about her taking the money,—yet he on oath has certified that he had also learned that Miss Greene had taken money.

His admission here that he knew all about her being accused, and that the investigation was to go on, and he taking no measures to notify her parents, makes his case look worse and worse. And can I believe him when he says, "Had she not determined to leave, the case would have been presented to the Faculty for final settlement. In the investigation and settlement her parents would have been allowed to take a part"? He says, "On Wednesday morning, at the request of the Faculty, I called to converse with her." Who believes that they had any intention of notifying me of her trouble? It does not appear, by the course they were pursuing, that they intended any such thing.

In the Reply, Torsey says, referring to his conversation with Louise the morning she left, "After she determined to go home, she said she would go to her sister's room and make arrangements with her." Again he says, in another paragraph, "Nor did I say, if she went to Lewiston she must make arrangements with Chestina." See how he contradicts the last two assertions, in a letter written to me May 27, 1866, four days after Louise left, when all was fresh in his mind: "She named going by the way of Lewiston, or writing you to meet her there, but did not insist upon it any further than merely mentioning it; finally agreeing, as I understood her, to make no arrangements herself, but allow Chestina to make them." As I have said in the "Crown Won," does this not look as if he knew she was not capable of taking care of herself?" Again he says, "She thought she had better leave that day." Hear her, in that letter to her sister, written the day she left, contradict this last statement of his: "Dr. Torsey informed me this morning that I had better leave to-day." See this letter in full, p. 39, "Crown Won." She does not say she thought she had better leave, but soon adds, "How I feel, God only knows." See on page 117 of "Crown Won," about his kind treatment of students.

In view of the foregoing statements and contradictions of Torsey, and all of his twisting and turning, as shown in my pamphlet of 162 pages, I am not at all surprised that he should deny the truth of my book, and declare it grossly false under oath—that is but a small offence compared to what I believe him guilty of. He has a right to his opinions, and I to mine, but the public will judge impartially.

One other point. If Mr. and Mrs. Daggett and Miss Case said nothing to Louise about the school knowing it, and as they say the

class knew nothing about it until the morning she left, and the students none of them knew it, how did she know the school knew it, and it was common talk and public property on the Hill, before she left? If Dr. Torsey did not tell her, for no one else talked with her, as she writes in her class letter, who did inform her? If I could have had an opportunity to retrieve the past at the Hill, who did prevent her from having a chance to retrieve the past at the Hill? Who had a long talk with her just before she left, and just before she wrote that letter? Will the public believe Torsey did not tell her the school knew it, and that she had better leave that day? See pp. 37-8, "Crown Won," for further explanations.

Torsey, in the Reply, testifies—"I then determined to send some one to Lewiston to look after her. I spoke to B. Harriman to go with his team; but after consulting with others I concluded to ascertain first by the return train whether she had stopped at Lewiston."

Miss M. I. Reed says, p. 54, "Crown Won," that Mr. Harriman agreed to go to Lewiston after Louise with Chestina, and she told him she would get Chestina ready in fifteen minutes. Miss Reed, in her recantation affidavit does not deny this, nor does Mr. Harriman. With those statements of Torsey's, as above, and the positive agreement of Mr. Harriman to go to Lewiston after her, who will doubt the truth of my logic on pages 90, 138-9, "Crown Won"?

I will leave the public to judge of the truth of Torsey's statements—he being the implicated party, and testifying in his own defence—and his denial "That I told her that the school knew it"; and R. Smith's denial that he told me that Torsey told him so is shown to be false by the following affidavit:

"In the month of August or September, 1866, I heard Roscoe Smith tell Jonas Greene, of Peru, that Dr. Torsey told him (Smith) that in answer to Louise's request to have this affair kept from the school, and she be permitted to stay and graduate, he told her that it would be impossible, for the school knew it.

"WM. S. WALKER."

"Oxford ss., March 21, 1868.—Personally appeared before me William S. Walker, the above-named, and made oath that the above statement by him made and signed, is true.

"WM. WOODSUM, JR., Trial Justice."

In reply to the affidavits of F. A. Robinson, J. L. Morse, D. G.

Harriman, and Miss P. B. Robinson, and notwithstanding their accusations against Miss Greene and myself, and their denials of the facts as stated in the "Crown Won," in regard to that conversation in the Faculty meeting, I affirm it to be true, as stated by us. Why it escaped their notice that Torsey stamped his right foot upon the floor so hard as to jar the room, is more than I can tell—unless they were so accustomed to his outbursts of passion and show of authority as not to notice it. Torsey does not deny it; Miss Case says, "he did not, to my knowledge." I utterly deny, and pronounce as *false*, that Torsey said, "What avails all this crimination? The object *now* should be the finding of Louise. How can we aid you in this matter? We are ready to do anything in our power to assist you." There is not a word of truth in those statements. The only thing Torsey did say, near the close, when it appeared as though he wanted to get rid of us—he did say, "What do you want us to do?"—making no reference to Louise in connection with this remark.

And now I wish to put one question to this D. G. Harriman. How dares he to make oath to all this conversation down to its close, when he and all that were present know that he left the room and house more than an hour and a-half before this Faculty meeting closed?

Miss Case admits much in her affidavit which others have denied, which goes to show what Louise said—"I think she said she took the clothing from necessity, as all her's had been lost, and intended to restore them at the close of the term." She further says, "Upon being questioned she confessed she took the five dollars." And I here again say Mr. Daggett did tell me she (Louise) confessed she took the five dollars, not denying a word.

Mrs. Daggett states under oath that, "We did not go into Dr. Torsey's part of the house; nor did he have anything to do, directly or indirectly, with the investigation in regard to the clothing or money." Now hear what Mr. Torsey says on oath—"The Monday evening before Louise left Miss Case called on me and informed me that Miss Greene had been taking articles of clothing not belonging to her; and that Mrs. Daggett and herself were investigating the matter. I requested her to do it quietly, and to say nothing to any one about the matter. I had also learned that Miss Greene had taken some money." Chestina writes from Virginia, March 31, 1868, and says—"Miss Case and Mrs. Daggett did go into Dr. Tor-

sey's part of the house first, that morning they came and searched the room; and I can tell you the way—I remember particularly. I went down to the college to practice. There Mira told me that Miss Case and Mrs. Daggett had gone up to my room and wished to see me alone. I immediately started back to my room and overtook them. They said they were going up to my room to see me. We walked along till we got to the house. They opened the front gate and went into the *front door*. I went into the side gate and hurried into my room, picked up some things laying about the room, and *changed my dress* before they came in. I was just fastening my dress, with trembling fingers, when I heard them coming. I remember this distinctly, and what dress I put on—it was that slate-colored one, like Estella's gymnastic dress." Yet Mrs. Daggett has on oath denied this *fact*. Chestina further writes me that she had heard Louise speak against Torsey several times. "Louise did advise me to enter the Seminary Course, as I should be put forward more, and be required to read before the school; and in many ways it would be better for me. 'And you will not be obliged to stay; you can leave any time.'" Then was it true, what Mrs. Daggett declares on oath?

Mrs. Daggett is quite ready in her sworn statement to charge me with making "additions, omissions, changes and exaggerations, in my book, which are untrue," as to herself and Mr. Daggett. She further says, "I never saw in the wash such garments as Mrs. Greene describes in her statement." I wish to ask her if she does the washing, or has personal knowledge of every article those sixty girls put into the wash? And is she trying to dispute Mrs. Greene in regard to the articles Louise had at that term? It may be as well for Mrs. Daggett to explain to me, and perhaps the public would like to know, how she came in possession of Louise's Adelpian pin, plainly marked with Louise's name, which she kept, with several other articles of Louise's, for more than four months—after we had written them that various articles of Louise's were missing. See "Crown Won," pp. 112-13, when and how they were obtained. I here re-assert, and will say I do positively know, that the only article named by Mrs. Daggett, in her statement of May 30, 1866, as found in Louise's possession, which was marked, was an old linen handkerchief with holes in it.

Sarah E. Dow says—"I think it incredible that she could have lost so many clothes in eleven weeks as she is represented to have lost during her last term." I do not know how Miss Dow should

know anything about Louise's under-clothes, except such as she borrowed of her to wear.

In answer to Eliza C. Bowers's very singular affidavit, I feel compelled to make a thorough rejoinder, and will ask the careful perusal by the public of all the facts here produced. Miss Bowers says—"I further say that Dr. Torsey was impartial and kind in his treatment of the students under his care. There was scarcely a student who did not think thus of him, and who did not love and respect him as a teacher and friend. I never knew him to make any distinction among the students under his care, or to show any partiality on account of any religious or sectarian views of any student. I have never intended, in anything I have written or said, to cast any blame upon the Faculty, in their treatment of my lamented classmate, M. Louise Greene; but sincerely believe they desired and intended to exercise justice and kindness towards her in this matter. Mr. Greene has given in his book several extracts from my private letters to him and Mrs. Greene, and S. R. Newell (not, however, giving my name), in answer to letters addressed to me, proposing numerous questions about the affair connected with my unfortunate classmate; also about the Faculty, especially Dr. Torsey, and Miss Case, the Preceptress. These extracts are published without my knowledge and consent, and in violation of the confidence which I placed in Mr. Greene. These extracts make me say what I did not intend to say, and what the letters do not say. Were the whole letters published?"

These charges against me compel me in self-defence to publish six of her letters, four to Mrs. Greene and two to Mr. Newell, in full, as they are all bearing upon this sad case; and more than all from which I have made a single quotation in my book; and the public will see that none of them are marked "private" or "confidential." And all can judge with what truthfulness these charges are made against me.

Miss Bowers further says—"The extract on page 138 was in answer to a letter of Mr. Greene, dated June 22, 1867." Then she quotes from what I wrote her. Then she gives what she says is the substance of her reply to me; and further says, "I am confirmed in this by a friend of mine, to whom I read my letter to Mr. Greene." I will inform Miss Bowers, her friend and the public, that I did not in my book quote a single extract or word from this letter of Miss Bowers. Thus she and her friend are very much mistaken in what

she did write me. And further, she has given, in her affidavit, for what she wrote me what another student did write me in June, 1867, and from which I did make the extract on page 138, "Crown Won"—from which Miss Bowers, in her zeal to implicate me and clear them, has mistaken this for her own language. I have both letters before me, and *know* what I write.

MISS BOWERS'S LETTERS.

BELGRADE, Sept. 24, 1866.

MY DEAR MRS. GREENE,—I was very glad to receive a letter from you, setting my fears at rest in regard to your feelings toward us. I did not believe you thought hardly of us, but I wanted to know from your own lips. We all truly sympathised and suffered with you. I never felt so badly in my life, except when my mother died, and that was a very different grief. I am just now excited by the rumor that Louise is at her uncle's, in Petersburg, Va. I cannot believe it, it is such good news. The way the story goes is this: A gentleman travelling South met a Miss Greene, from Maine, at your husband's brother's, and conversed with her. He described her, and the description agreed with dear Louise's appearance. Knowing you would know if it is true, by this time, as Ches. was gone there, I write you immediately—hoping, yet scarcely daring to hope, it may prove true. If you have heard from Ches., if you will, please write me immediately, I am so anxious to know. I can think of nothing else than perhaps Louise is alive, well, and with friends. So will you please take for an excuse for my not writing you a letter; but be assured, I feel the deepest sympathy and regard for you, and wish to be numbered among your friends for Louise's sake. If this rumor should prove true, I shall write her a sisterly letter, as of old. Nothing that has occurred will make the slightest difference in my feelings. But I dare not think of this; I dare not hope the rumor is true. Write me soon, and believe me, with love,

Truly your friend,

ELIZA BOWERS.

BELGRADE, Oct. 14, 1866.

MY DEAR MRS. GREENE,—I received your letter containing the sad news to-night. I've never ceased to hope till to-night that Louise was still living. I knew not till now how strong those hopes were. How terrible! that her poor body has lain there all this time. I am so glad she is found; yet the uncertainty, with hope, was

almost better. I wish I could be with you, to pay my last tribute of love and respect to dear Louise's body, even. But I fear it is not possible, though I thought at first I must and would be there. I think, if I remember, there is no way to go in one day, by cars or stage; and I am much too far away to come with a team. I can say truly I shall be there in spirit, as will all the class. I've written them all this eve., except Miss Forsett; and I judged you had written her, or would before this, and I'd just sent a letter to her this morn. I am very glad to say that none of the class, to my knowledge, said they would not graduate with Louise. I think I should have known it if they had. Truly, I never said or thought so. The rumor must be classed with a thousand others, false like that one, with no foundation whatever, saving the imagination of some gossiping persons. I have not words to express my sympathy with you, or my own sorrow, which is very deep; but I scarcely dare speak of it when I think of your deeper grief. We can only pray, knowing Jesus suffered too, and can and does pity our suffering. Louise is at rest now. I can only hope she is better off than she would be if tossed on the billows of this troubled life. If you can, I wish you would write me all about how you found her, and how long you think she had lain there. It seems as if I must see her, even as she must be. I cannot realize that it is our own Louise that we loved so much that I am writing of. It is too dreadful to think of. If I had only spoken to Louise of this that morning; but how could we? We would believe nothing of it until she was gone. So we talked to her until she went away, as if our hearts were not full of bitter anguish. When we knew the truth, we believed her good and true, but only suddenly tempted. No one of the class but feels so, and would have then received her with open arms if we only could have had the opportunity. If Louise could only have known how we suffered that she left us so. Addie Webb and I called for her Wednesday morning, to go to breakfast. We went down to the hall together, and that was the last time I saw her. I was longing then to throw my arms about her and tell her of my love, but could not;—how could we then? We were almost crazy ourselves. I wish I could see you and talk of these things; sometime I hope I shall. Good bye. I shall think of you hourly all this sad week; and I'll not forget you when I pray. Jesus only can give support in this hour.

Most truly and affectionately yours,

ELIZA E. BOWERS.

BELGRADE, Dec. 11, 1866.

MY DEAR MRS. GREENE,—I should have written you before, but my pen seems almost palsied. I can speak no words of consolation to you; yet I feel, O! so much, for you—and my own grief is not light. I began a letter for Ches.; but I could not write what I wished, so I threw it aside. I suppose she is in Virginia. Is she not? I regret so much now that I did not go to your place; but I did not know how you would feel about it. It is so dreadful that Louise should die so! It is so mysterious! Did you ever see the poem Louise wrote for the public Adelpian last spring? It now seems prophetic of her fate. I ask myself every day, Why is it so? I dare not judge the teachers of *intentional* wrong—though that some great wrong has been done I think none can deny. In regard to what you ask me, if the others you named would have been treated so, I know not what to say. There certainly ought to have been no difference. There seems to me a fatality about it—about everything connected with that last term. We can never understand with mortal powers; but I trust sometime *all* things will be clear, and we shall see all things in their *true light*. I would like some of Louise's hair very much. I have a picture of her which I would not part with for money. It is very strange where so many of Louise's things are. Louise's room was open after she went away till you came for her things; yet it scarcely seems that any of the girls would go there and take anything; though there are things taken as supposed every term by the help, and were last term at the close of the term. I have in my possession two napkins which belong to Louise. I forgot them when you came for her things, and they've lain in my trunk ever since. I've intended to send them to you, but have neglected, or waited for an opportunity. I see you are to erect a monument over Louise's place of death. I shall visit the spot, I hope, but only with such bitter feelings of distress for her fate. *Louise was very much loved by the students*, and with but very few exceptions. I think no one will deny that. I always loved her, even before I knew her well; and since I've known her intimately I've counted her among my dearest friends. Louise was a true friend, and had the kindest, most sympathising heart of any girl I knew. We always sought her when in trouble or sorrow. I shall never forget the last time I was sick there. She sat up with me. I was so nervous I was almost crazy. She bathed my head and petted me till I was perfectly calm. I should always remember

her with the kindest gratitude for that alone, if for no other cause. Her life was full of sympathy and care for those around her. Write me again, if you consider this worthy your time. I shall ever be happy to hear from you for Louise's sake, and hope some time to see you. Remember me in love and sympathy to your family.

Affectionately,

E. C. BOWERS.

Before I give her letters to Mr. Newell, perhaps I should explain why her class was written to for such a statement of her character, as they understood it, prior to the accusations against her. It was because Mrs. Daggett had, in November, 1866, admitted to us that she did accuse Louise in that investigation of being an "habitual thief"; and gave us to understand that the students did not think well of Louise; and very unfavorable reports were continually reaching us, as coming from the Faculty, against Louise's previous character.

BELGRADE, Dec. 17, 1866.

MR. NEWELL,—Your communication is just received. I shall be most happy to do as you wish, for Miss Greene was a very dear friend, and one highly esteemed by me. I wish time to consult other members of the class. How soon do you wish to publish this? It will be a week or more before I can hear from the members of the class, as we are widely separated. If you will wait this time you'll oblige,

Very respectfully,

ELIZA C. BOWRES.

BELGRADE, Dec. 28, 1866.

MR. NEWELL,—I scarcely know what to say to you after writing my former letter. I was unable to consult the class, we were so far separated, so we might act together. I thought then I could as easily speak to the public of Miss Greene as to you, or any one in private. But when trying to write for publication I could not do it, and for several reasons think it best not to publish anything. I regarded her character as above reproach until this last act; this I could say, but it has been said continually to the public. We all know she ought to have been saved; but we, as it were, were paralyzed with grief, and did not act, as we now regret so much. I have written Mrs. Greene more fully.

Very respectfully,

E. C. BOWERS.

BELGRADE, Dec. 28, 1866.

MY DEAR MRS. GREENE,—You probably know of the letter we as members of dear Louise's class have received from Mr. Newell, of your town. I thought immediately it would be a pleasant task, and wrote Mr. Newell that I could and would do so most gladly, but wished to consult the class. I have been unable to consult the class so we can act together. I have tried to write; and I could write of Louise's character with much pleasure; but when I came to say, until this last act, I could not write it for the public to criticise. I knew Louise took that money from her letter; but I believe that for a moment she was under an influence she could not resist, and therefore not guilty of an intentional error. The cold eyes of indifferent people cannot feel thus. I think of Louise's last request, to forget her; and cannot feel to bring her before the public again, which were she living she would shrink from, most of anything. Her letter I prize highly. I believe every word of it, and have not the slightest feeling but love and kindness for her memory. If it would do Louise any good I would do anything right. I cannot think you will misunderstand my motives in thinking it not best for me to publish a statement of this. I do not know where you were intending to have this published, or in what form, but suppose in the State papers. Please let me hear from you again soon; and believe me truly your friend,

E. C. BOWERS.

These letters show her to have the best opinion of Louise, and her desire to have the class consulted and act together. But there must have been some power behind this naturally truthful and kind-hearted young lady to have prevented her, as her letters show, from giving Mr. Newell a first-rate statement of Louise's standing up to the time of her trouble. None of her class were requested to say a word about that last act, or to blame anybody therefor. Who has advised, assisted, and obtained from her the very flattering statements in her affidavit, as to Torsey's love for and justice to his students, his impartiality and kindness to them, and how she knows that, is more than I know. And as to her belief that the Faculty desired and intended to exercise justice and kindness towards Louise, seems to be somewhat doubted by her letters. And what has led her to make such statements as to what she wrote me, and the unfair extracts she accuses me of making from her letters, I do not know. But one thing I do know, that Miss Bowers's home is in

Monmouth, the present residence of Rev. D. B. Randall, who is one of the authors of the Reply to my book, and he is also one of the Trustees of that Seminary and College.

In regard to Miss A. S. Fuller's affidavit :

I did not call several times in the winter of 1867, to talk with her about Louise. Only once I called and talked with her. She then told me what I state in my pamphlet, on page 78. The second time I called I met her and another lady just out on the sidewalk. She stepped into the entry. I then told her I only called to say that Mrs. Greene desired to have her write and give her a description of the garment, as it was said it was plainly marked. (Mrs. F. had told me that it was not.) She agreed to do so. We went immediately out. The lady waited outside for her. I called again for this letter; am confident I did not stop at all then. These are the only times I called on her. There was no urging at all about getting that letter; and why she should so state I cannot tell, nor why she says that was a *strictly private* letter. There is no such request or intimation in the same. If this classmate regrets that a "word in season was not uttered by our class to save her," or to go to her the night before she left and utter words of sympathy and consolation, how can she say that "I have always thought that the Faculty did everything they could have done to save her"? If a word from her class would have saved her, would not the same from the Faculty have been as likely to have accomplished the same?

There is not a person living who shall read all the facts in this sad case but who would see and believe that if the female portion of that Faculty had gone to Louise in a kind and friendly way, that night or the morning she left, and spoken words in kindness and sympathy, they would have saved her. Why is it that this classmate shows so willing a disposition to clear the Faculty from all blame, and then represents the largeness of Louise's faults, and closes with the assertion that she committed "suicide"? That is unknown to any person. As this assertion is made by other parties, I will here state that when her remains were found, though very much decayed, they were in no way disturbed. She lay nearly straight, with her right foot crossed and resting on the left, with her shawl on, close up around her neck; the left hand laying on her breast, close up to the crossing of the shawl. It had the appearance of holding the shawl close together under her neck in her last

moments. This hand was not gloved. The other hand was thrown back under her head, as persons are accustomed to do in such position, to rest the head upon, especially if they have no pillow, or to ease the head from a hard substance. Her hat and reticule were set close up under the large projecting rock under which she partly lay, she laying her head a little from the rock, on a small mossy knoll, thus giving room for her hat and reticule between her head and the rock. Her feet and legs lay closer to the rock. Her water-proof had been taken off, and appeared to have been spread over her when she lay down. The wind had blown or slipped it over towards the rock. It there lay nearly the whole length of her; near the top a handkerchief had gone into the fold with it. Her head and shoulders had slipped off this mossy knoll further from the rock, which caused the head and shoulders to turn on to the right side. Her hand was under her cheek, where it was so much decayed that some of her teeth and finger nails were left in the decayed matter when her remains were removed. Three weeks after, Mrs. Greene and I found several teeth, and a finger ring, with some finger bones, in the space of the size of a hand, covered with a putrid mass and leaves. This hand had a kid glove on, mostly decayed. The other glove was in her reticule. In her reticule were found a common ink-bottle, pen, pencil, note paper, a few envelopes, some other small articles, and a small memoranda. There was not a word written or anything there found to give any explanation of her fate. Dr. Harris, who assisted in removing her remains, says there was no evidence how or from what cause she died. He thinks she did not take the poison, which it is believed she purchased at a shop in Lewiston. He gave me several good reasons why he thought so. If she died from the effects of poison, how could she lay so apparently quiet, straight, smooth, with her hands and feet in that position, just as calm to all appearance as if she had lain down to sleep. So all testify who saw her. I have thought that she lay down tired, exhausted, broken-hearted and chilled to death. How long she was there before she died, no one knows. That she did commit suicide, no person is authorised to say. And whoever says that shows a disposition and would, in my opinion, exaggerate every circumstance possible against her.

In R. Ella Pike's affidavit—

I find her very ready to say that "Louise would evade the rules whenever she could without detection. Her general character was

that of a sly, cunning person." These are bold assertions, for one who had roomed near her but a portion of one term. She never boarded in the College, while Louise was there thirteen terms. She was not in her class, and had but a slight acquaintance with Louise. While in the "Reply," Miss Perley, who was one of her class, and had known her intimately for three years, says: "As to my opinion of the character of Louise I can truly say I knew nothing against her. I never knew any violation of rules on her part. As to her veracity, I never questioned it. Of her possession of a skeleton key I had no knowledge. Of Louise as a classmate I loved her truly, and at her death I was a sincere mourner." Feeling compelled to publish Miss Bowers's letters (another classmate of Louise), which brings out a strong re-endorsement of Louise's good character, her great love for her, and fear of the sad results which followed—and no doubt but what at the time that feeling was largely shared by all of her class, as well as all others on the Hill—with the long personal knowledge and intimate acquaintance that Misses Perley, Bowers and Webb (three of her classmates) had with Louise, and their endorsement of her general good character, the public cannot fail to see why students of slight acquaintance should show such disposition to defame her "general character." Let those who wish to know what those students who knew her intimately for the three years say of Louise's character, turn to and read, pp. 61-3, "Crown Won," what there is said of our departed child.

Miss Pike says—"On the morning Louise left she came to Chestina's room, where I was studying alone." (How came she in other girls' rooms in their absence?) She goes on to tell such inconsistencies, and what all the subsequent acts of Louise do not sustain, and shows such a disposition to make out so bad a string of statements against her, and make so favorable a case for Torsey, and so conflicting with Chestina's and Miss Reed's sworn statements, in this long extract of what she has chosen to get up against the dead to please the living, that I put but little confidence in anything she has stated. I shall let her pass by, reminding her that she could find some violations of rules nearer home, if she should try. Does she remember, in the absence of Dr. Torsey, in May, 1866, of any riding, hunting and fishing excursions made by students, in which her brother took a part, with my team, in the absence of Mrs. Greene and Louise, May 12, 1866, and the threat she made to tell Dr. Torsey if they did not catch her any fish, and other small acts of disobedience?

In Miss N. E. Hunton's statement she says—

“I gave him a minute description of the undersleeves, not only of the manner in which they were made, the peculiar stitches, etc., but also of the material of which they were made, and of the different marks by which I was able to identify them.” What a charge this student brings against me, and what is the offense? What are the different marks she gave me, by which she could identify them? Let her letter answer: “The above mentioned articles were of my own make, and consequently the stitches were somewhat peculiar; moreover, the garment consisted of a part of a dress I had worn in my younger days.” This is every word of description given me in that letter, which I now have before me. And no other mark was given me in that letter but the peculiar stitches, and no description as to how they were made is given whatever. The reader sees how false are her accusation and statement of what she wrote me. There was no other mark whatever given me but what appeared in the “Crown Won.” A person who will make such a false statement about what she had written me, I will not believe a word she says about Louise speaking in Torsey's praise, or anything else of what she pretends to know of Louise's feelings.

In regard to Mrs. H. E. Merrill's statement of the amount of washing done for my girls in the fall term of 1865, it is false, so far as Estelle is named. She was not there that term. And as to the amount of clothing washed by her, if she means the public to understand that was all the clothing the girls had washed while there, she is much mistaken. The girls used to do more or less of their washing each week; and while Mrs. Greene was there, about four weeks, while two of them were sick with fever, she washed some things every day; and several times bundles were sent home to wash, and other articles taken back. As we had to make three trips home during those four weeks, she could not know much about their clothing. This shows a foolish yet labored effort to make out something in their favor. The statements of other persons and students as to the amount of clothing she had, and not hearing her complain of losing clothing, etc., and Mrs. Patterson's statement from recollection after the lapse of six or seven years, about what Louise lost or how abundant her wardrobe was, and the assurance that “Mrs. Greene's statement of her daughters' losses is not correct,”—this attempt to contradict Mrs. Greene, the mother of Louise,

in regard to her statement about the loss of clothing, the mother who furnished all, who knew all about the making, marking, washing, ironing, packing and unpacking, six times a year, to take to and from that school for five years,—yes, I repeat, those students, stewardess, and others, who could know but little about her undergarments, to attempt to contradict the statement of the mother's own *positive knowledge of facts* that must be fully *known* in such a case to every mother sending a daughter far away into a college to board, among so many students—and no person who knows Mrs. Greene and the fact that she had free access, year in and year out, to my store of goods of almost every description, but knows that she would not send her eldest daughter to such a place without ample undergarments. Mrs. Greene says such garments of Louise were abundant at every term she was there. Such attempts by this Faculty to work up something to offset our statement of her losses, our positive knowledge of the facts we state, may satisfy their friends; but the public at large will see through their labored efforts—their access to and the favorites by whom they are surrounded, and the motives of the members of this denomination and those whom they can influence, to over-state every little thing in favor of them and against Louise and her friends—to put much confidence in this effort, and a thousand other things worked up and stated in the Reply.

Mr. Packard's affidavit—

In regard to my going to his place to purchase his house, I can inform him that he is entirely mistaken. I did not go there to purchase it. I went to carry articles to my girls who were occupying a room in his house. He then for the first time told me he was about to leave the State, and should sell his stand if he could. I had learned that Torsey had made him a standing offer of \$2500 before I talked with Mr. Packard. I knew this was said to be a good house, and desired to look it all over, thinking some day I might want to purchase or build a like one. He showed me the same, stated his price, which was \$2700, and his reason for selling, etc. I made him no offer whatever. But I then thought he would make use of the circumstance of my being there and looking it over, to help him sell it to Torsey. He (Torsey) would not like to have me so near to him, perhaps remembering my plain letter to him a year and a-half before. And I have good reason to believe (as Torsey was seen talking with Mr. Packard that morning, before this looking over the house

took place) that he (Packard) made the most out of it, to make Torsey believe I was there to purchase, and help him get his price, the other \$200. While I was gone two or three hours to the Corner on business, Torsey closed the bargain at \$2700. And the representations of Mr. Packard to Torsey at that time may have something to do with the production of this affidavit, which bears evidence of haste or carelessness. One gross mistake for a man of his business capacities to state under oath—"Early in the spring of 1866 I determined to sell there and remove from the State." Now I would like to have Dr. Torsey, from the date of his deed from Mr. Packard to him of the sale of this stand, inform Mr. Packard that in the spring of 1866, he (Packard) had no such property to sell on Kent's Hill; that his deed of the same was given on or about 24th of January, 1866; and that Mr. Packard had, long before the spring of 1866, ceased to be a resident of this State. I will inform Mr. Packard that I was not disappointed when in a few hours I returned and found the bargain closed and the deed made to Torsey. It is easily seen that there was no necessity for such haste if Packard believed I would purchase the same. If not, Torsey would take it, why this haste? Was it not, when he got Dr. Torsey up to his price, that he feared, when I returned, Torsey would find out that I did not want to purchase, and had made him no offer whatever, and then Torsey would back out from his offer. He (Packard) understood what he was about. Dr. Torsey's fear that I should live too near him, or his desire to get the stand, prompted him to give the other \$200. I was pleased to think how my presence there at that time had helped Mr. Packard to sell his stand at his own price, and to see the manœuvering of Torsey. My silence is grossly misconstrued in Mr. Packard's affidavit.

It is very strange that while Mary E. Chapman could not remember to tell us, in November, 1866, scarcely a thing about what was or was not in their room when Louise left, or but little about the whole affair, that more than a year later she makes so long and minute a statement as appears in her affidavit. And her statement that she had "never received any but the kindest treatment from Dr. Torsey," is so much at variance with what she has heretofore told and written, that I can but remind her how and why it was that she left that school, close at home, and went miles away, to Westbrook, two terms, and with what she said to induce Louise to

go with her, and afterwards wrote her, makes her present statement look incredible to us, especially when again she says, "I never knew nor believed that Dr. Torsey made any difference in his treatment of students on account of their religious opinions." This does not agree with what her father told us in Nov., 1866, and why she went to Westbrook. He also told me, at his barn, this same time, that he felt bad to think Mary left her alone that night, and it was because Mary and some other girl, or girls, were talking about Louise, and how bad she would feel. Some of them said they should be afraid she would do some act of violence to herself or room-mate; and he said as Mary was of a nervous temperament, she was afraid to go back to her that night (which was the night before she left). Mary says in her affidavit, after telling how she had gone, "I then feared that she might commit suicide. This fear was caused by the fact that Louise had told me that once before she had attempted to commit suicide. She also added, 'If any great calamity ever happens to me, I think I shall commit suicide.' She told me these things *confidentially*." And again this room-mate of Louise says, "I did not stay with Louise the night before she left, but had no permission from any teacher to be absent from my room. On the contrary, I twice asked Miss Case for permission to stay with Miss Hunton that night; but she positively refused to grant my request, and told me that I must stay in my room." Miss Case swears, "I did not advise Mary Chapman not to remain with her that night, and did not know that she did not intend to remain with her." How are these statements reconciled? And how does it look for the room-mate, after what she has stated about Louise telling of intentional suicide, and against express orders to leave her alone, after the talk with other girls about her doing acts of violence, and remain away from her and give no warning to others to look after her?—their "dear sister," as she afterwards wrote me, and one that had been a sister to her, as she said of Louise. And why this long statement, so favorable to them and against her? With her own admission of breaking the express orders of the Preceptress, she seems to be in good standing with this Faculty. She may have learnt that "acquiescence in the *opinions* and decisions of the Faculty would cover a multitude of sins." On the other hand, Louise had learned that they would notice little things done by her that they would not in others. While Miss Case refused her reasonable request to go up to see her mother—see p. 90, "Crown Won"—she obeyed. As to Miss Chap-

man, she has betrayed the confidence of her departed friend, and as it looks to us, to gratify the malice of Louise's enemies. We feel justified in quoting from a letter of her's, written to Louise from Westbrook, Sept. 30th, 1864, in which she describes an offence committed by her and other students, for which they were summoned before the Faculty: "They talked, but not as they do at Kent's Hill, far different. Their talk did not consist in threats, but he talked to us as well as a parent could have done. They spoke to us very kindly and dismissed us. They talked splendidly. I wish you could have heard them."

Notwithstanding all that B. W. Harriman has stated in his affidavit, and "the falsity of these extracts," pp. 90, 138-9, of my pamphlet, as he says, yet I affirm they are true; and he not only said that, but another time, as I met him on the street, I said, "I am sorry that you did not go to Lewiston after her; I think if you had you would have found her at the Elm House and saved her." He said, "I think so." Why, if he remembers all about Torsey's asking him "if he would take a team and go in pursuit of Louise," as stated in his affidavit, did he not tell us that on the night of the 29th of May, 1866, when Mrs. Greene and I stopped over night at his house, when he appeared to be willing to give us all the information he could? He told us no such thing. And when I asked him, on the 26th day of January, 1867, why he did not go to Lewiston after her, he did not then say a word about Torsey's request, as above, or name Dr. Torsey at all, until I asked him how soon he saw Torsey after he returned from the depot. And when he said some one suggested waiting until the return train, to ascertain if she stopped at Lewiston, I asked him if it was Torsey, or what he did say. He said he "did not remember who it was or what Torsey did say." Yet when called upon by this Faculty or their friends, he, like many others, can remember everything desired so minutely that it is surprising to all who read their Reply. His statement that the "travelling at that time was very bad," is not true, as I positively know by going to Lewiston the next morning. And the reason that Mr. Chandler was so long coming here that night was because he lost his way after dark. I know it was first-rate travelling for that season of the year. And those over-strained statements are seen in this affidavit all through. If, as he says, she told him she was going to Lewiston, and the reason for going, and would return that night,

she appeared all right, why *did* he "ask the ticket agent for what place she had bought a ticket"? And why did he tell me, six days after that, "he thought he ought to get on to the train and go to see what became of her"? Torsey had written me, May 27, 1866, that he thought our fears were groundless as to the course Louise had pursued. He tells Chestina and Miss Reed he has no fears of her, etc., the day she left. With all this from Torsey, Mr. Harriman testifies in the hearing before the Trustees, June 5, 1867, "After he (Torsey) found she had left under such circumstances, he urged that we had better start immediately after her." In the Reply he says, "I soon met Dr. Torsey, who asked me if I would take a team and go in pursuit of Louise." A wonderful fact and strong statement!—enough to spoil the whole, in view of Torsey's own statements to us, and what he had written. I know he is wickedly trying to deceive the public; and if others could know as well as I do the influences by which he is surrounded, they could better judge why it is done.

"I, Louisa M. Greene, hereby testify and declare on oath that I did not tell Mr. Chandler on the morning of May 24th, 1866, at my house, that 'I am sorry Louise has done as she has, but hope the matter can be so arranged that she can go back and graduate at the end of the term.' [Go back in twelve days and graduate, how improbable.] I further say that this statement is false, as I do know from the fact that Chestina had already told me that Torsey had told her it would not be best for her to go on to the stage and graduate; and against his wish I knew it would be impossible for her to do so. But this I did say, I hoped it would come out right. He remarked he hoped so, but feared it would not; said it was the general belief on the Hill, if she had taken money and clothing as represented, that she was crazy and she would make way with herself. As soon as he retired Mr. Greene was called, and our worst fears were excited he and Chestina was off as soon as possible.

"LOUISA M. GREENE."

"Oxford, ss., May 5th, 1868.—Personally appeared the above-named Louisa M. Greene, and made oath that the above statement by her subscribed is true.

"Before me, JONAS GREENE, Justice of the Peace."

Mr. Chandler states on oath, and asserts what I have said on page 33 in my pamphlet, about what I said he told me. By reference to

said page, the reader will see I there state no such thing. I do not connect Mr. Chandler with what I say Chestina told me. Then I say, "Mr. Chandler said," &c. An attempt of this committee to falsify facts through Mr. Chandler.

This committee, a majority of whom are Methodist clergymen, who go about preaching and proclaiming the gospel of Christ to fallen man, who profess to be his followers, they would have you believe they embodied all that was great, good, noble and righteous here below—perfect patterns to follow! In their Reply they commence by charging me with making "garbled extracts from anonymous letters." I brand this charge as *false*, and *defy* them to produce the proof. And I will here repeat what I have said in my book, that I have not in the same made a single extract from any letter marked private or confidential, notwithstanding the committee's charge of "falsehood" against me. Yet with this charge of "garbled extracts" scarcely dry from their pen they do the same thing, by publishing extracts of Mrs. Greene's letters to Dr. Torsey. Why did they not publish the whole of those letters, which would have put a very different phase on them? Why follow (as they would say) this wicked practice which they denounce in me?

They say, "Mr. Greene makes no small parade of his religion." I brand this charge as *false*, and will appeal to every reader of the "Crown Won" for the truth of the same. I have not set myself up as a pattern of piety, or attempted to *force my opinions* upon the public; but did say (see preface of "Crown Won"): "To err is human." If I am in error, after giving the facts and circumstances on which I base my opinion,—if the public shall decide that I have no cause,—I stand corrected." (See the whole of said preface.) They find fault with the "spirit and temper exhibited" in my book, If true, how much worse spirit and vindictiveness have their committee exhibited all through their Reply. Think of the loss of our child, and look at their special pleadings against me, judge and say, ye parents of Maine, who has the greatest cause to complain. I will quote from the editorial of a city paper: "The spirit of Mr. Greene's pamphlet we could not endorse, though the natural feelings of a parent afford some palliation and excuse. The spirit of this reply finds no sympathy with us, in so far as it attempts to put the worst construction upon every act of the unfortunate girl. Her dying confession to her sister, published in both pamphlets, tells the truth, we have no doubt. By

that let her be judged. Those who have not sinned more may condemn; but how few the number." From an editorial of another paper, when speaking of those letters written by Dr. Torsey to Mr. Greene, after his daughter left, I make the following extract: "These letters are in terms so insulting to Mr. Greene, so destitute of common courtesy and wanting in dignity, and so deficient of every lineament of Christian charity and forbearance, that all we wish to know of a man in order to form an estimate of his *true* character is to know that he wrote those letters."

I think they will be ashamed of their charge of falsehood against me in Miss Bowers's, Reed and Hunton cases.

Also they state and put forth as a fact that "the tuition in the College course, while Miss Greene was in the Institution, was \$6 per term." The following copy from her bills, as paid by me, will nail this falsehood right here:

KENT'S HILL, Nov. 4, 1864.

M. L. Greene—

To Maine Wesleyan Seminary and Female College, Dr.

To 11 weeks board (\$3.25),	\$35.75;	lamp chimney, 15;	incidentals, 25,	\$36 15	
Tuition, \$7.00;	books, \$8.11,			15 11	
					\$51 26
Winter Term, Feb. 24, 1865—					
Tuition,				\$7 00	
Incidentals, 25;	books and stationery, \$6.71,			6 96	
Twelve weeks board, \$4 per week,				48 00	
					\$61 96
June 5, 1865—					
Tuition, \$7.00;	Chemistry, \$1,			\$8 00	
Incid., 25;	books, &c., \$5.90;	catalogue, &c., 66,		6 81	
Board, 12 weeks, \$45;	sheets of music, 40,			45 40	
					\$60 21
Nov. 9, 1865—					
Tuition, \$7.00;	incidentals, 25, books, \$5.96,				\$13 21.
(She boarded herself.)					
May 25, 1866, Spring term—					
Tuition, \$7.00;	incidentals, 25,			\$7 25	
Painting, \$10.00;	materials, \$4.36;	books, &c., \$8.80,		23 16	
					\$30 41
Besides board bill, which I paid but took no receipt for.					

This Committee speak sneeringly of the amount I have paid to this Seminary. If such bills are computed three times per annum, for five years, and a part of that time for two other girls, it will amount to more than they can wink out of sight. Add to this their begging bills for meeting house purposes; and presents to teachers, and various projects to coax and draw money out of those 100 to 250 students, with incidentals, amount to a large sum yearly, which goes to build up that Institution, and fill the pockets of those who run it. Those little pickings are by the force of circumstances wrung out of many a student who cannot well afford to contribute, and would not if they could well avoid it. They are shrewd beggars and ten cent figurers up there. (See catalogue price of board.) Those who are there less than eleven weeks per term, ten cents additional will be charged per week. (See tuition and incidental fees per term.) "Students who remain less than six weeks will be charged ten cents per week additional tuition." "No deduction for the first or last week of the term." "Books and stationery are kept at the Seminary, and will be sold at reasonable prices." Those reasonable terms I found to be from twenty to forty per cent. profit on books, stationery, slates, pencils, pens, diaries, and a hundred little notions which they furnish students. On those sales the profit amounts to no small sum yearly, which comes out of those 200 or more students, or those who send them there. I had in the fall of 1865 three daughters boarding themselves; and while the two youngest were sick with a fever, Mrs. Greene went there to take care of them, and stopped about four weeks. Being crowded for room, Louise watched part of the nights with the sick, and part of the time she took her meals and lodging at the College, for about two weeks, for which she paid her board while there, the usual price. It is known to all how inconvenient it is to take care of the sick away from home; and many little extras can be procured at home that cannot conveniently be obtained elsewhere; and neighborly assistance relieves much at such times. Mrs. Greene tells me that during the whole sickness, not one of that Faculty ever called to offer or know if she desired any assistance whatever, or sent the least thing (except a bunch of grapes), and from no source was there anything sent them. Whether this was because they were self-boarders, or their prejudice against Louise, I do not know. Although I had paid them for Louise's board about five hundred dollars, and had received no deduction for her absence on business,

to visit, or at camp-meetings, during this five years, they did not from the college send in a single article to those sick girls; and once, when the girl desired some broth, and Mrs. Greene could not just then get it elsewhere, she sent to the College for a pound or two of fresh beef, which they took pay for. Whether they will deny this, as they have other facts which were said to us and transpired before us, at the College, and in that Faculty meeting, is yet to be seen. They are *truths*.

In 1863, when Widow Knight, of our town, went there to see about sending her daughter to that Institution (the daughter afterward did go awhile), Louise invited her to stop over night. They charged Louise seventy-five cents for Mrs. Knight's horse-keeping that night. Mrs. Knight on finding it out refunded it. This I know by reference to her receipted bill for that term. And these are what she meant in her letter to us in 1864—"All he has done is to drain father's pockets, and give me what justice demands he should give the meanest student"—see p. 26, "Crown Won."

Mrs. Greene had no one to call on to assist her through this sickness but Louise; and she, with all her studies and school duties to perform, had to run round for and get the necessary things for their wants, assist her mother, and watch with the sick ones a part of the time.

The whole tenor of this Reply, and those of this Faculty, and other fear or favor seeking witnesses who testify to her appearance and actions before she left the Hill and on her way to the depot, are so over-stated, and show her to be, if true, so hard and unfeeling, beyond all precedent, that it looks so barefaced and bad, that no reasonable person can believe them,—when those words, "Heart breaking; dearly beloved, adieu!" were written just as she left the College—and all she wrote in those two letters—and her weeping appearance at the Elm House, and on the road to her couch of death,—are in and of themselves a complete refutation of this *wicked, damnable* testimony against her,—and with all the evidence given to the public of her previous good character, honesty and truthfulness from a child, as known to all. We, her parents, are not bound to believe all that her accusers say they said and did with her, and what she first admitted and requested and shew them, and what they say she afterward and immediately denied or equivocated about. By her whole life we have a right to judge what she would be likely to say and do in that hour of trial—especially when it is

for the selfish interest of this whole pack to say what they do to attempt to clear themselves from blame. This may go down some people's throats; but I will not and am not bound to take the dose. Torsey does not deny his stamping, his prejudice, and many other things. I charge him with wrong doing. He does make a sort of sweeping denial of the statements, and says they are "grossly false," as made up in my pamphlet, of fragments of different sentences as to convey false impressions. He dare not particularize what wrong I had done in quoting from his letters, as I have them to produce. He chooses to get others to testify for him, and not to burn his own fingers.

And as it is attempted and labored hard in the Reply to show that she thought well of Torsey, and would have the public infer from it that he (Torsey) was particularly kind to her for a long time before she left, I feel compelled to state that I have positive proof from her writing, and other evidence, that she had good reason to and did dislike Torsey continually the whole of the last year and a-half she was under him; and that about one year before her departure she wrote a long letter to us, explaining anew all the annoyances she was receiving at his hands, her wish and desire to leave that school and go elsewhere, where she could be treated fairly. She makes mention of the fact of writing the letter, and what it was about, and on the whole she concluded not to send it to us; so we never saw the same.

Torsey's dislike of Louise and prejudice against her are so well known, and are so clearly shown in my pamphlet, that he dare not, and it would be useless for him, to deny it. He said, when I charged him in that Faculty meeting with prejudice against her, that he and Louise had made up. Now I appeal to any candid mind, was not that virtually admitting his prejudice. Dr. Torsey does not deny his lecture, as described in Louise's diary—see "Crown Won," p. 28. The admission of this one fact should convince all that the other circumstances as described in her diary and other writings were enacted there as described by her.

It is not strange to me that such numbers of certificates so favorable to Dr. Torsey and his associates have been worked up through the influence of this denomination, which I am told by one of their ministers is so large and powerful, reaching all over the State, that it would be useless for me or one family to contend with it. I believe that I know something about their crushing process, as felt

and described by my poor dying girl to her sister in that letter where she says, "It will be useless to try to stem the tide; bend beneath it or it will break you down; say nothing of excuse or palliation." I am aware that this breaking-down process is going on to crush and break down me and my family. And for what? Because I dare say what I know and believe. But I will charge Dr. Torsey and his associates, while on earth I stay, and if need be at Jehovah's Bar, with dealing under *prejudice*, which sent our child from their presence broken-hearted to an untimely death, when they could have saved her.

This Committee speak of consulting counsel in regard to my book. If I am rightly informed, they have had an attorney employed for a long time in getting up the Reply. This mountain of influence has labored long and hard to produce the same. And the public may think that some of their language and phrases are more suitable for pothouse politicians than for a choice committee, the majority of which is composed of ministers. Covert accusations against me and family, such as "libel," "falsehoods," "sentenced to the State Prison for the crime of perjury," "depth of depravity," "such convicted felon," "utterly undeserving of belief, whether under oath or not under oath," "promulgating falsehood"! All choice language, coming from those who profess to love God and man!

But this is not the first time in the history of this denomination that such a crushing process has been carried on. And, as it were, heaven and earth were moved to clear a big *villain* who was proved to have been seen going to and from a haystack in a field where the remains of Miss Sarah M. Cornell were found the next morning hung to a stake, in 1832, in the town of Tiverton, near Fall River, Mass. I have the pamphlet of 191 pages beside me, of that trial, in which can be seen the mighty effort made to break down the deceased's written testimony against that Rev. E. K. Avery, who was one of the leading clergymen of the Methodist denomination. Not only to destroy her written testimony, and the influence of her friends. The whole New England States were ransacked to obtain funds and witnesses, who, it was believed, were suborned, to testify against her previous character, and to clear him. No time or money were spared to disgrace her memory and acquit him, whom the public more generally believed guilty after his acquittal than before. We know something about this wicked affair, as Mrs. Greene lived at that time in the vicinity, with a leading Methodist family, where

she heard and saw much of their plots and schemes to clear him, and of their own private opinion of his guilt. Yet publicly they would loudly proclaim their opinion of his innocence.

The most cruel acts on record have been committed in the name and under the garb of religion. And the most wicked, cruel and bloody wars recorded in ancient and modern history have been prosecuted under the same name and for the same purpose. The most cruel tyrants and despots of the Old World shield themselves under the same garb. And a *man, sect, or government* which fight under that cloak are the most to be dreaded and feared. I think Dr. Torsey's prejudice is so clearly shown in my pamphlet, and his disposition to annoy students who doubt the justice of his decisions and do not acquiesce in his opinions, it is not necessary to pursue it here; but will mention that on one occasion this desire to control did find vent, and was brought to bear upon one Andrew Walsh, a teacher in that school (a gentleman of splendid educational acquirements), for voting in 1855, as he was of different politics from the managers of that school. Yet he chose to exercise his right of suffrage, and did go to the polls and vote, which brought down the displeasure of the refined and over-wise would-be rulers and judges of what a student or teacher on Kent's Hill should think, say or do while under their supervision and instruction, at this fountain of all morals, as they would have you understand. At early dawn, September 11, 1855, near the church on Kent's Hill, on a tree, hung the form in effigy of this learned teacher, Andrew Walsh, who could fluently speak a dozen or more different languages. To show their malignity and disgrace Mr. Walsh, there were about a half-dozen different devices, written placards, attached to his arms, feet and body, a mean and contemptible affair, all of which was published at that time. I have the evidence and published account, establishing all I have said in relation to this disgraceful affair, and know whereof I speak. For days after this act took place, no signs of disapprobation were seen or any means taken by Dr. Torsey to disapprove or condemn the act. Not until some of the oldest students had drawn up a paper and were circulating it for signatures, to condemn this transaction, and an account for publication had been sent off, did Torsey move to ferret out the actor or condemn the act.

His forbearance and kindness to students might not be much helped by consulting some students—the one who said all the notice he had of his expulsion was just ten minutes to pick up his things

and leave the Hill. And a young man by the name of Lord might think when he claimed to be sick that pulling him out of bed and jerking him about his room, by Dr. Torsey, was no very kind act to him.

This Committee have spent much argument, under a mistake, or design, as to what room I claim the wrong of entering without authority—see “Crown Won,” p. 121, all about it. They had better pick their flint and try again before they make so long an argument on false premises. Yet they claim her (Louise’s) room was at their disposal the same, and “did not belong to her any more than a man’s house belongs to a child who occupies one of its rooms; and the teacher has the same moral and legal right to enter her room as a parent would have to enter a room in his own house occupied by a child.” If this logic is true, how can they escape universal condemnation for not exercising parental care and protection over those who occupy such rooms? They find fault and would have the public blame me for publishing Louise’s letter to her sister, when the class letter (which is about the same) which this committee know that letter was written to her class, with a request for them to do with it as they would like for others to do in like circumstances to them. “Decide for me,” she says. That letter was copied and sent in many directions. And that committee of students did copy the worst sentence, “garbled extract,” from the same, in their whitewashing report, and ask all the newspapers of the State to publish it to the world. And when in my pamphlet I give a fair account of both sides, all they charge her with and their excuses for so dealing with her, and with her own written statement, which was given to the public by her class, through that letter. And to free myself from the liability of any unfairness, so that the public should have all the facts before them, I publish both letters, while they in their Reply publish only one—an unfair attempt by this Committee to mystify the fair course I have pursued in this heart-rending affair.

Another charge they bring against me is the sale of my book at “highly remunerating prices.” A grave charge, in the face of the *fact* that they are *selling* their book for as high if not higher price, according to the amount of reading which it contains; while they have the advantage in selling theirs, through their circuit preachers all over the State, as has been the case with such reports as they choose to send out from Kent’s Hill, instead of paid agents, as in my case, to sell my book.

"Who are its authors?" "And where was it printed?" These are the slurs thrown out against me, which I care but little about. But so far as its author is concerned, I will say that no attorney or clergyman prepared or saw a single sentence of the "Crown Won" before it was published. And the same is true of this Rejoinder. As to where it was printed, I will say it was printed at a responsible house, who when properly called upon will state all the facts desired, and where I thought the office would not be besieged by Methodist ministers.

They try to make a false impression upon the reader where they refer to where I say she lost at the sixth term three pairs of white woolen stockings—all she had. Just add; of woolen stockings. I did not say but what she had cotton ones, which she always had, and there was not a term when she did not have more than three pairs of stockings with her. It may answer this Committee's purpose to try to satisfy their special friends, to say that "the statements of Mr. and Mrs. Greene are undeserving of any credit, whether made under oath or not," in relation to the amount of clothing our daughter had when she went to the College to board; but it will not go down with the mass of thinking people. They will believe that her mother did know what her daughter took with her, eleven weeks before she was sent away. She does know that, and also what she carried to her during those eleven weeks. And we do know that from Louise's ample stock of common under-clothing, which has been returned to us or accounted for, there was but one pair of drawers so old and worn out that they could not be worn. The remaining articles are so few that it is a heart-sickening sight to look at. I wish my readers could see them, so that they could appreciate what a miserable and wicked attempt there has been made, by drumming up outside testimony, to discredit our positive knowledge of what we state.

In addition to all that Louise has written us, and what she told her mother in October, 1865, about her fears that she would not be allowed to graduate, Miss Reed says that Louise came up to where she and Ches. boarded, about two weeks before she left, and said (while speaking of the short time before the term would close, and of the end of her school life), "Do you see anything now that will prevent me from graduating?" She (Miss Reed) replied, "No, unless you are sick; and then you can substitute painting." Thus showing a fear up to the last that she would not be permitted to graduate.

The careful reader of the "Crown Won" will see that many of the complaints and points I make against the whole management of this sad case are not answered in the Reply. And one great fact the public must see. That they pursued in accusing, searching (even to her body) and lecturing, until they broke her down, and sent her heart-broken away, which caused her death, without notifying her parents. He failed to fulfil his moral obligation, and to extend to her parental care and protection. And, without cause, his writing those insulting letters to me in June and July, 1866. The haughty, overbearing manner in which he met me in Lewiston (the first time I saw him after it was known Louise was dead), while I, with a sad and aching heart, was there for her remains. Again, the 8th of November, soon after her burial, when Mrs. Greene and I were on the Hill to see if we could get any satisfaction in regard to their treatment of her who they then knew was lost to us forever. Before this, as many know, various slanderous reports had gone from the Hill, as to the cause, and where she had gone—all false, as the sad result proved. After passing Dr. Torsey's house and going towards the College, and as I was putting up my horse at Mr. Adams', which was near the College, where we were going, and as Mrs. Greene stood waiting on the side of the street, Mr. Torsey came down in a lordly manner—he was talking to a young lady in a lively tone—and just as he passed Mrs. Greene, and as I was approaching her, he, as it appeared to us, to show his disposition, and careless indifference for our presence and feeling, gave a loud laugh. His whole appearance and bearing was haughty, and as much as to say, "I care not for your presence, your sorrow or disappointment—it does not affect me. I am lord of all I survey; from the centre all over Kent's Hill there's none my right to dispute. You may stop or pass along."

In view of all that has transpired on Kent's Hill, and this wonderful Reply, I am constrained to exclaim, "How fearfully and wonderfully (self-righteous some people are) made. People often become so self-righteous, so tenacious of power, of denominational pride and self-will, as nearly or quite to take away moral accountability; and it is often very difficult to determine whether their ravings and maledictions proceed from a sane or an insane mind,—therefore their sayings should be received with great caution. "Whether those who claim the right and do use skeleton keys, use them wrongfully, we do not certainly know." We do not know of any way how such

articles as belts, buckles, bosom-pins, napkins, and many other articles could disappear from Louise's trunk. We do not see how certain articles belonging to Louise, *which were plainly marked*, came into the possession, and why they were retained months by one of her accusers.

The public will see what any one may expect from the managers of this "safe and pleasant home," if they dare say that they do not believe them perfect in *all* things. The covert and mean insinuations against their old student, now she cannot answer for herself, their great effort to put the worst possible construction upon every act of her's, getting *positive* affirmations from those who *once* were in doubt about things—even the rattling of a door, the late appearance at the breakfast table, are set down to Louise as vicious *acts*, while it is *well* known that it is an act of everyday occurrence for students to come to breakfast late in the College. Also *their* labored attempt to make the public believe that we are perjurers, liars, devoid of parental affections, mad, crazy, unfeeling, and proper subjects for the State Prison. Parents cannot fail to see the *safety* of that "pleasant home."

I think every intelligent reader will agree with me when I say that I would as soon trust myself or property in the hands of highway robbers as with a set of men who will tell me "it is not their object to deprive me of any portion of my wealth," and then go on to stigmatise my character and that of my family. I would not believe them if they said *that* "under oath or not under oath." It may answer the purpose of this Committee to try to put a gag into our mouths, and to stop us from expressing our *opinion* of Dr. Torsey, or any one who dealt with our girl, and call these opinions (as in the case of Mrs. Greene's letters to Dr. Torsey) *atrocious libels*. The public will see by dates that Dr. Torsey's insulting letters to me were written a long time before Mrs. Greene wrote him. And her letters were written him on account of his insinuations against her and her dead girl, which if this Committee and the public understood as well as Dr. Torsey must, they would better account for some things therein written. If this Committee will publish the whole of Mrs. Greene's letters to Dr. Torsey, they will brand their own assertion as false, "that the substance of these letters are mostly given in Mr. Greene's book," which is not true. Knowing the selfishness of human nature, and the cool indifference with which many look upon the wrongs committed upon others, they

counsel patience and forbearance. Yet those same persons, when a like wrong is committed upon them, no matter who are the perpetrators, will show the greatest resentment, and will not care who is hit.

Those *pious savans* are hard to please. They ridicule me in their *characteristic* style as representing my daughter "so nearly perfect," and again in *mock solemnity* bewail my lack of "paternal kindness and love." For the perfectness of Louise's character I respectfully refer them to the letters of her classmates, the numerous letters I have from other students, and her townsmen.

Contradictory testimony of Kent's Hill witnesses—

Mrs. Daggett on oath says—"We did not go into Dr. Torsey's part of the house, nor did he have anything to do, directly or indirectly, with the investigation in regard to the clothing or money."

Dr. Torsey declares on oath—"The Monday evening before Louise left Miss Case called on me and informed me that Miss Greene had been taking articles of clothing not belonging to her, and that Mrs. Daggett and herself were investigating the matter. I requested her to do it quietly, and to say nothing to any one about the matter. I had also learned that Miss Greene had taken some money." Dr. Torsey swears that he knew about the matter and gave directions, while Mrs. Daggett swears that he did *not*. Which swears false is more than I can tell. And how Torsey knew about her taking money Monday evening, before her confession on Tuesday, is passing strange, if there was not preconcerted action among her accusers. See also Mrs. Daggett's denial of going into Dr. Torsey's part of the house before entering Chestina and Miss Reed's room. See Chestina's sworn statement, p. 56, "Crown Won," and her letter to me of March 31, 1868, where she explains how she knows she went into, and when they came to her room.

Again, look at the inconsistency of B. W. Harriman's sworn statement and what Dr. Torsey wrote me. Harriman says, "When I got back from the depot I soon met Dr. Torsey, who asked me if I would take a team and go in pursuit of Louise." The day after Chestina and I had been on the Hill, the 26th, and found those two letters, which, with all other circumstances, had caused me to express great fears on the Hill of her destruction, and I then believed that most of her class and other students had the same fears, or they would not have shown by their tears and anxious looks, such signs of grief as they did. My fears must have reached Torsey's ears, as I did not

see him. Torsey writes me, May 27, 1866, "I do not think your fears of the course Louise has taken can be well founded." * * He three days later tells us in that Faculty meeting he had no such fears. He tells Miss Reed the day she left, "he had no fears of that." He also tells Chestina, "Oh, no; I do not fear that." See her affidavit on page 57, "Crown Won." Now with all these assertions of Dr. Torsey, and the fact that no team was sent after Louise, who will believe that he asked Harriman as soon as he saw him, "if he would take a team and go in pursuit of Louise"?—especially when I have this same Harriman's testimony before the Trustees, June 5, 1867, wherein he says of Dr. Torsey, "After he found she had left under such circumstances, he urged that we had better start immediately after her." Which is true—Dr. Torsey asking him to take a team and go, or his urging him to start immediately? Who believes all this, if Dr. Torsey had asked and urged, but what he would have gone?—if he had been so anxious, but what some one would have been started immediately? If this is not overstrained testimony, then I am no judge. I think they can prove most anything they choose. I have all the testimony before the Trustees' meeting of June 5, which is very positive, and is worth preserving.

Our assertion of favoritism is proved true by this Committee in their seeming approval of Mary Chapman's disobedience of the positive orders of the preceptress. The labored exertions of this Rev. J. W. Hathaway, to back Mr. Houghton down in a simple statement of facts, must be convincing to all what they have done to get others to do.

Having obtained from a student a copy of one of Louise's exhibition pieces, the one mentioned as lost in the "Crown Won," I will give it to the public, and ask my readers to judge of this, and with all of her other productions, as published in the "Crown Won," whether Louise's opinions were well founded that Torsey's prejudice had and would prevent her from receiving any prize or reward for the best composition, book-keeping, painting, or anything else, while she remained a student under him. She had striven hard to excel in some of these branches. She had been a student there longer than most of the others. She had, long before she left, become satisfied that it was useless for her to try, after she had so well learned his prejudice. She has a record in her diary, saying (after her attempt to obtain it in book-keeping), "It is no use for me to try. I shall never obtain a prize here. Oh, dear! how hard I have tried. But

I did not care so much on my own account as on father's, as I think it would have pleased him." She was generally acknowledged to be as good a writer as there was on the Hill; and it was believed by many that justice would have given her the prize in composition, painting and book-keeping, during her stay there. If the prize pieces, etc., could be placed beside her's, the public could better judge whether justice was done her in those cases. I believe that they have a way to manage so as to have their rewards turn up where it will best gratify their wishes, or make to their pecuniary advantage—a sort of project to increase the number of students there.

ANCIENT AND MODERN CHIVALRY.

How often have I longed to welcome back the days of ancient chivalry. How often through the long vista of departed years have I gazed back upon the first faint gleam of that chivalric spirit which broadened and brightened till its enthusiastic spirit lit up all Europe and the Holy Land!

Peter the Hermit, poor and untitled, who, moved almost to madness by the injuries of his brethren at Jerusalem, raised to frenzy the hearts of nearly six millions of his people, and hurled them like the surging waves of ocean upon the shores of Palestine.

Boemond, Prince of Tarendum, who, at the first unfurling of the red-cross banner dashed his armor in pieces with his battle-axe, and from it made crosses for his soldiery; and with him Tancred, called noblest of the Christian chivalry, of whom historians have discoursed and poets sung. These are but few of the many who left home and heritage to die in a foreign land. Even the children, with scrip and staff, prepared to journey eastward.

Like all other human institutions, chivalry presents a new aspect in every page of the book of history. Sometimes it is severe and stern, sometimes light and gay; but the qualities of valor, courtesy and enthusiasm shine out at every period of its existence. At the battle of Cressy, where Edward the Black Prince fought for his knightly spurs, word was brought to his father, Edward III., that his son, then a boy of fourteen, was surrounded on all sides by the enemy and needed succor. "Is he dead, or overthrown, or so wounded that he cannot continue to fight?" asked the king. When told that his son still lived, he added, "Go back to those who sent you, and tell them to ask no aid from me, so long as my son be in

life. Let the boy well win his spurs, for please God, the day shall be his, and the honor shall rest with him." Who that has perused the pages which recall those deeds of valor, those romantic adventures, those tournaments, where all brave knights might try their prowess, and where glove, ribbon or jewel from the hand of lady love was the chief incentive to exertion and reward of success,—who, I repeat, has not regretted their departure, and mourned in his heart that the days of chivalry were past. Bold baron and belted knight have vanished from the scene of action, and their deeds are as the recollection of an half-forgotten dream. Yet who shall dare to say that the Spirit of Chivalry is not living, moving, breathing among us at the present time. Better than lady fair is love of country, purer than ambition's fire is the hope of a nation's freedom. Nay, we do wrong to compare the two; for the first wild flashing-up of a rude spirit of honor, in those dark ages, was to the present life-or-death struggle for freedom what the lurid glare of a meteor is to the calm, steady light of the sun. Our heroes are everywhere.

By the widening Mississippi,
On the prairies of the West,
Where the broad Potomac rushes,
Union troops for battle thirst.

They fight not for a shadow, the gay phantasm of ambition has not lured them from the quiet of home pleasures, but wives and mothers have said to them, "Go! for our country needs you more than I." God bless them! With the echo of ringing bells and booming cannon, proclaiming the glad news of victory for truth and right against treason and rebellion, still sounding in our ears, who will not with me say, All hail to Modern Chivalry!

Who will believe, if she had been fairly dealt with, she would not have received some reward of merit during those five years? Her writing brings to light some things which were unknown to us while she was living.

Persons invested with much power become tyrannical and capricious, almost of necessity, and the self-dependence of those under them is much impaired by relying on favor, hypocrisy and fawning, playing on the weaknesses of those autocrats, and not studying, by patient diligence and integrity, to deserve and reap their due reward. However strange it may appear, yet it is a self-evident truth, that disobedience thrives on severe examples. A close observer cannot

fail to see that an aspect of external obedience is maintained by severe discipline, which veils much of the real effect from superficial observation. The good conduct which insures the granting of favors, may consist in betraying a friend, or in some other way crushing out or blunting that nice sense of honor which is so desirable in every person, and which should be the part of education to cultivate and strengthen.

It might be as interesting to some portion of the reading public, who know the limited education of this H. P. Torsey, for this Committee to explain how, where, and by what means he has received some of his titles, as it is for them to ridicule me for the want of a better education. They perhaps might be as profitably employed to sustain the reputation and credit of this Institution, by explaining some things which have transpired on the Hill before Louise went there, as they are in stigmatising her character and abusing her friends. If the veil could be lifted, perhaps the public might see that some of their managers have not made a very *nice* "distinction between vice and virtue." How far that veil will yet be attempted to be lifted, depends upon the action of others. Tell me, ye wise Committee, is there no deception, or false pretenses, for the Trustees, of whom you are a part, to proclaim to the world by *titles* that your Principal is possessed of every literary qualification desired, and ask the parents of this State to send their sons and daughters to an Institution whose head teacher and president is so deficient in the *languages*.

This Committee have the unblushing effrontery to accuse us of a lack of love and care for our child. They had better cast the beam out of their own eye, etc. *They* speak of love and *care*. What love was shown Louise, and what care for her? I refer them to her class letter. That letter ought to be engraved with a pen of steel upon their hardened hearts—"I could have died for one friendly hand grasp, and thought it happiness to die." Think of this, kind reader—how came she to pen these, her dying words, if there was any friendly hand offered, kindness or sympathy shown her; neglected and cruelly deserted by those "*people of God*, the leading members of the little church at Kent's Hill." It is not surprising that they feel compelled to publish to the world that they *are* the "*people of God*."

This Committee's unfeeling and contemptible slur about the spot where Louise's remains were found, is no more than we ought to

expect. Her life and character seemed to be invested with no sacredness in their estimation; therefore it is not strange that they appear to be divested of the common feelings of humanity. This is in keeping with the whole treatment we have received from those managers of that Institution. Yet there is to be a monument erected, and the spot suitably dedicated, of which the public will have due notice, and no favors will be asked of this Committee.

They also have spun out (in their closing special pleading) a long argument to try to create the belief that we are hard with and unfeeling towards our children. This will not take with our children, or with those who know us. And to show the love, confidence and respect Louise had in and for her mother, I will quote a little from her diary: "January 20, 1866—Such a nice old day with my mother; had her all to myself this P. M., only the girls kept running in." "21st—Mother was quite sick all last night. My precious mother! All that I have and all that I am, under God, I owe to my mother. Even Sarah spoke of the great change in her since G. H. died. And I am powerless to help." "March 27, 1866—Coming up from the College, found Ches. and mother had come." "28th—I have devoted this day to my mother—a pleasant duty." "29th—Came from the Packard house by seven, just before mother started for home. The day began with wind and snow, but ended in a drenching rain. Did I do wrong to detain her yesterday?" Will the public believe that she in her right mind would have feared to have gone to that mother whom she always spoke so kindly of and loved so dearly. That mother who Louise knew loved her most tenderly, and would have done anything in her power to have assisted her under any and all circumstances.

This Committee, in the Reply, have endeavored to create the belief that Louise had not lost articles of clothing; that she had not complained of losing any. Yet they are contradicted by their own witnesses. Miss Case says, "I think she said she took the clothing from necessity, as all her's had been lost, and intended to restore it at the close of the term." None who should see what was left and returned to us, would doubt the "necessity." Mr. Daggett testifies before the Trustees, June 5, 1867 (I have a copy of all that testimony), and among other things says, "She said she had also lost articles of clothing, and had endeavored to keep her clothing good." Then is it true, as stated in the Reply, that Louise made no complaint of losing clothing? Let those "people of God, the lead-

ing members of the little church at Kent's Hill," tell me who took the money, the postage stamps, books and clothing, from Louise, before they further pursue and testify to disgrace her memory, and try to break down all who dare to defend her.

I think it very strange that Miss Huntington should, as she states in her affidavit, after locking herself into her room, take out her key and hang it up in her room. Now for what reason would she do that, if she desired to be alone and quiet while, as she says, she was studying? She would simply take the key inside, turn it, and let it remain in the door, as it would not be but a short time before she would want to open it again; and it looks very strange when any one knocked at her door that she should not answer or go to the door. How did she know but it was some of the teachers? And who, if knocking at a door in that manner, would stand a minute or two before they would knock again? The most usual course would be to immediately repeat the raps, and the occupant would reply in some way. It is also strange that she makes no allusion to this, to Louise, until she is dead and could make no answer for herself. And it is still more strange that at this late day she can so distinctly remember, in the absence of her room-mate, what she had done with her key. "My room-mate's key was also hanging up in my room." A little too positive, I should think.

As I have shown, p. 83, "Crown Won," that Miss Church was not accusing any one, I will give here an extract from a letter of her's to me of August, 1867, in which she says: "I communicated my suspicion to none but my sister and *one* other, till requested to do so by my *superiors*." She also says in this letter she lost the money "Thursday evening or Friday morning." Here is another strong proof that some of her superiors (she does not say who) were seeking, requesting some, to implicate this old student, who had but a few more days to remain with them; and as Miss Church writes me she went home Tuesday morning, this request of her superiors must have been made before the investigation and the searching of Louise things, as her confession was that day after Miss Church had gone.

In most all of the statements and affidavits of students, Mr. and Mrs. Daggett, in the "Reply," there are admissions of mixing and losing of more or less articles of clothing, and that Louise said she took them from necessity, and intended to return them when she found her's, or leave them at the end of the term.

In reply to Mira I. Reed's recantation affidavit, and with what she has declared was said at my house, and what was said and done at Readfield when she gave me her affidavit—how she could and why she did make this statement, is more than I can tell. I shall make my statement just how this affidavit of her's was given to me, and all the material facts connected therewith, then produce the evidence I have to corroborate the same, and with the circumstances and means for remembering the facts, and let the people judge who tells the truth. In the fall of 1866 I learned by reports that Miss Reed had made some statements in regard to Louise leaving, and particularly in regard to Torsey's admissions as to that conversation he had with Louise, and being desirous to get the facts in this sad case, I wrote her at Roxbury. She soon after called at my house and explained, and said, "As she was coming down so soon, she thought she would call and tell me, as she had not time to answer my letter (or words to that effect). When she, her brother, my wife and other members of my family, were seated, I asked her to tell me all about what Torsey said and did on the day Louise left. Seating myself at a table, with pencil and paper, I carefully took down her statement, which was nearly verbatim as it appeared in my pamphlet. She gave the statement freely, without hesitation, in full, and did not appear as though she desired to hold back anything, and she never asked a single question what I intended to do with it. I had no occasion to repeat my questions or to urge her in the least. And it is very remarkable, if as she says in the Reply, "I did not answer his letter, because I did not wish him to have any writing signed by me, I fearing that he might use it against the Institution at Kent's Hill," that she of her own accord should call here and tell us so freely what she did. Had she written she need have stated only the *facts*. And here is where the trouble is, the facts are against Torsey, hence their great efforts to suppress or break them down. She gave me no occasion for, nor did I tell her, "You need not fear; this will not be used to injure you." She again says I said, "This is a matter of great interest to us, and we wish to know all about this, *simply for our own satisfaction*." The former part of this sentence is correct (and who would not want to?); but I positively deny saying the latter, "Simply for our own satisfaction." When she got through, I said, "If you could stop I should like to rewrite this with pen and ink, and get you to sign it." But knowing they were in a hurry, and they could not well do so, I

only mentioned it. They said they could not stop any longer, as they intended to go through that night. Having received several letters from Miss Reed, speaking well of Louise's character and standing on the Hill, I wrote in the first part of her affidavit a short recommendation and explanation. And then from the minutes I had taken at my house, wrote out the affidavit, leaving several blank spaces where I thought she might wish to explain further, or where I thought I might not fully understand how she meant to state or explain. Soon after she was at our house, when I took those minutes, it came to us that she had told other persons in our town, where she had visited, about the same she had told us. I remarked to Mrs. Greene that if she had told others what she had us, it would in some way reach Torsey's ears at Kent's Hill, and Miss Reed would have to suffer for it. He would in some way annoy her, or would get her to recant her statements about his admissions to her, what he said to Louise, and she (Louise) desired to have done. He would get her pledged by words or by writing so that we could not obtain the facts. I knew this man so well that it would not do to have him know that Miss Reed had informed or given me the facts as she did at my house. This is why and the only reason that I was so cautious about having it known in Readfield, what my business was when I went there and obtained that affidavit. And why I did not have that writing finished and read in the presence of the Skolfield family, in the kitchen, was for fear that some neighbor or student from the Hill would drop in upon us, and report to Torsey, or to some of the parties interested on the Hill. For the same reason I did not request the Justice before whom she appeared to make oath, to read it, or to inform him of its contents, was because he was a stranger to me, and might disclose the same, as I then thought it would be to her great injury to have it known while she was a student there.

On Saturday, January 26th, 1867, I went to Kent's Hill with my team, and called on Miss Reed and asked her if she would like to take a ride with me, as I desired to talk with her. And as she, her brother, and Miss Springer, were boarding themselves, it brought the matter so fresh to my mind, when I used to go there when my girls were there, with the long struggle Louise had with books and tutors there, and the wicked management with her, without notice to me, and her final destruction. And those students, referring to those things, and of my coming with and after her during those five

years. It was not strange that I did at the mention of those things shed tears. Those tears ought not to make against me, nor be construed as an effort to induce her to go with me (if she so intended it), in the Reply; it is wicked beyond measure. She showed no signs of holding back and not going. I said, as it was Saturday (no school) and work-day with them, "Perhaps you have so much work to do you cannot go." She said, "We have not much to do." Miss Springer gave her to understand she could do the work, and in a very short time she was ready to go. As we left I said to Miss Springer, "We shall not return till after dinner." I had told Mr. Skofield that if she came with me, to give us the sitting-room, with a fire in it, for the reason before explained. I had informed him for what I was going after her, and said she might not come. I think there was something said to her by me when I asked her to take a ride, about going as far as the Corner. After arriving at Mr. Skofield's and having the horse put into the barn, as I intended to stop there until after dinner, and after getting seated I told her what I wanted, and went on to read what I had written, and said, "If I have not got it written as you understand it you will tell me, and I will make it as it should be." Part of those blank spaces was filled and part was not. Some of them were crowded and some partly filled, just as her statement and explanations required. They remain so to-day. The filling out was done with very pale, poor,—what I call frozen ink. It bothered me to write with it very much; before I finished I warmed it quite warm and shook it up, and it did a little better toward the last. When I had finished reading and filling it I re-read it through; then gave it to her to read, and told her I wanted her to sign it, and go before a Justice and make oath to it. As she was reading it to herself, and when I thought she had got to those largest filled-up places, and thinking the pale ink and some close filling up would bother her to read it, I asked her if she could read it all, and said, "If you cannot make it all out I will assist you." She said she could read it all; and when she had finished reading it she went to the table and signed it, with the same ink and pen that I had filled it out. I did not hurry her. We took dinner there, and talked some time with the family; then took her to the Corner, before Justice Bean, who asked her some questions, administered the oath and made the affidavit. As we left the office, Miss Reed said to me, if I was not in a hurry, or could wait, she would like to see her friend (aunt, I think she said), a

while. I told her I could wait, and would take her there. She said, "It is but a little distance, and I will walk." I said, "Very well," and unhitched my horse, led him to her friend's house, hitched him, and went in; stopped as long as she seemed desirous to stop—about half an hour, I should judge. I then took her back to the Hill. She did not, at my house or at Readfield, ask me what I wanted this for, or what I was going to do with it, or in any way during the whole transaction ask a single favor or assurance from me as to keeping it from the parties interested or the public. I thought very strange of it at the time. I did once, and only once, of my own accord, say to her that, "Nothing you have said or done shall be known while you are a student there." I was not in great haste while at Mr. Skoffield's, and did not read the certificate rapidly. She did have time to read it as long and as thoroughly as she chose, and the writing is a plain hand, except some of the filling, which was there done with that pale ink, as the original will show. The vacant spaces she speaks of can now be seen on the same. I did not tell her "I left these spaces for the purpose of inserting other things afterwards." If I had inserted other things, as she insinuates, those blank spaces would be filled, as also the bottom line, above her signature, would be filled, where there is more than one whole line above her signature now blank. I never told her, "I will put this document in better language." But I did say to her, about the time she was to sign it, I wished I had time to re-write it and put it in better shape (meaning, of course, before it was signed and sworn to, it should be done, if at all). She must have so understood it at that time. She did tell us at our house that Miss Bowers said, "Won't you go and see Dr. Torsey; I think you will do best with him." Could not Miss Bowers have gone to Dr. Torsey as well as Miss Reed. There was some reason why she did not besides that given by Miss Reed. She did say, and I took down at our house her exact words, that Dr. Torsey, "in that first conversation in our room told us that he had never suspected Louise of any dishonesty in that direction."

All the main points in her affidavit, in "Crown Won," were taken down by me at our house, as she admits in the Reply; and the public will judge whether I, from my notes taken down at the time, have not the means of knowing what she did tell us better than she and her brother have from recollection one year afterwards, as stated in said Reply. I did not ask her to say anything against

Dr. Torsey, or the school. I only asked her to state what she knew — *the facts* — without any reference as to who it would hurt or please. She gave me what I then and do now believe was true. There are some things Miss Reed did state at our house not given in the “Crown Won,” which I will here state. Mrs. Greene and I recollect them well. One was when T— told Ches. and I, and when I cited her going in her poorest clothing. He said that looked like going into the factory to work, or running away. She (Miss Reed) said “that made her mad clear through.” She said two students went into Louise’s room the night before she left, after Mary Chapman had left her, and stopped awhile; and when they were about to leave, Louise said, “Girls, don’t leave me alone.” Mira said that seemed the hardest of all. She said she ought not to have been left alone, and if she had known it she should have gone to her if it had been in the middle of the night. She also spoke of the carelessness of students about clothing, and related incidents. Said one time Mary Chapman went down to a party, or public gathering, at the Corner. She by mistake wore another student’s cloak. It was there lost, and Mary’s father had to pay for it. Also, she said a lady student, told Miss Robinson that she had found a handkerchief in her possession with another student’s name marked on it, and they might accuse her of stealing it, as they did Louise. She said she lost, after Louise had left, a large music book in the College building, from the room where she practised. Mrs. Greene did not say in that conversation at our house, when I took Miss Reed’s testimony down — and she utterly denies of saying, “For we already know enough against them back of this, without your testimony.” The absurdity of this statement is seen at once, as we were then trying to get more information. She also denies saying “You need n’t try to shield him,” for we did not think they were trying to, and she had no occasion to say that. Miss Reed did say, after all she had told us, and as she was about leaving the house, “I do not wish to say anything that will hurt Dr. Torsey or the Institution.” This was in the fall of 1866, and in January, 1867. She gave me her affidavit (after she had graduated from the Seminary, and was no longer a student there). I received in reply to one I had written her, a letter from which I make the following extracts :

“BELGRADE, July 4, 1867.

“I do not know as Dr. Torsey knew that you wrote me before, but

some were condemning me, thinking I was coming out against the Institution, and I had not said anything against it. You know that I never did to you. Ben. Harriman said he thought I was in league with you, informing you of all their proceedings, and injuring the Institution all I could. I have always been a friend to Louise, but I am not to judge those who dealt with her, and never have. There were some girls in my room when I received your letter, and I spoke of it to them. Your letter proved that I was not doing more than I pretended. I have been in a bad place, and have kept as quiet as possible; but I did not escape the tongues of slanderers. My neutrality only excited suspicion. That letter you wrote me *made* my case clear, and of course could not injure you. I do not wish to say or do anything to injure the Institution, and do not think you wish me to. Those questions you asked me, and answers you have *written* down are *only* the plain *facts*."

The reader will see although Torsey did not know of her affidavit, yet a suspicion had sprung up against her (hence his watching for and obtaining my letter), and she felt a pressure or prejudice before she graduated. What she "was pretending" to do I do not know, when she says, "I have been in a bad place," etc., "I did not escape the tongues of slanderers." Who they were she does not fully say, but clearly indicates one of them. One question—What were their "proceedings" on the Hill, for which they would be justified, or choose, to annoy or slander any student for informing any person they chose. (Kent's Hill fear, favoritism or mental insubordination, I would call it.) Her "neutrality" would not answer their purpose; they were not willing for her to state facts of what she knew. "I do not wish to say or do anything to injure the Institution, and do not think you wish me to." Then she assured me long before I published my book, "Those questions asked me and answers you have *written* down are only the *facts*." After this, what was my surprise to see in the Reply her affidavit. The public can judge when the evidence is before them :

"This is to certify that on the 28th of November, 1866, at our house in Peru, Mira I. Reed, of Roxbury, in conversing about the sad affair—of what she knew about M. Louise Greene leaving Kent's Hill, and her subsequent death, told in substance the same as

appeared in her affidavit in the pamphlet entitled 'Crown Won,' and I would so testify under oath.

"EVELINE A. KNIGHT, aged 22 years.


"Peru, Dec. 26, 1867."

Knowing that Miss Reed and her brother came direct from S. R. Newell, Esq., when they called on us in 1866, when she gave me her statement;— Mr. Newell then lived in town, but now is Register of Deeds of this county, and resides at Paris;— not having seen him or any member of his family since December last, I wrote him to know if he and Miss Gammon would give me a sworn statement of what Miss Reed did state at his house in regard to what appears in her affidavit in the "Crown Won." From each I received the following statements. This is all Mr. Newell has in any way to do with this Rejoinder:

PARIS, April 20, 1868.

FRIEND GREENE,— Your request was duly received, but such has been the press of business that I have been unable to give it that thought and attention which I desired before answering you. In the present condition and aspect of the case I feel extremely reluctant at giving any affidavit to be connected with the matter as proposed. When honorable senators come before the public with statements under oath concerning what their own eyes have seen and what their ears have heard, and learned and reverend D. D.s step forward and swear as plumply that such statements are false; when reverend gentlemen and learned professors write private letters, and then in affidavits before the public swear to the reverse of statements therein made; when intelligent and fair-famed deponents make oath to statements one day and the next swear that their testimony was false, or was never made; when deponents complain to the public that they have been duped or tearfully persuaded to swear to what is false;— there is reason to fear that the public will withhold all confidence in affidavits connected with any matter that seemingly has such a tendency to demoralize and corrupt the morals of the parties interested therein. The public perhaps, to-day, would award me a fair reputation for truth and veracity, but should I volunteer an affidavit, the '*pros*' or '*cons*' might reasonably raise a question, after the adverse statements that have appeared, which I have no disposi-

tion to discuss nor the folly to covet. As to what Miss Reed said at my house in the fall of 1866, I do not think I could from memory give her statement with accuracy, in her language, as she expressed herself at the time. We had at that time quite a conversation respecting the case of Louise, all my family taking part in the talk. Many of the statements made by Miss Reed were in substance, though perhaps not in the same language, as they appear in your book. I recollect of her mentioning her conversation with Mr. Harriman relative to going after Louise, and of her wishes and anxiety in that matter — of the expressed fears and feelings of Mr. Harriman — of the excitement on the Hill — of the delay — and her own feelings of impatience, etc.; but what language she used to express these ideas I cannot remember to quote. I do not think she *did* use the terms ‘terrible suspense,’ ‘terrible commotion,’ ‘terrible excitement,’ etc., etc. These expressions, I presume, were the language of whoever wrote out the affidavit for her to sign. It is not often that deponents write their own depositions. Hence it is the case that illiterate people and extremely broken in language are made the authors of flowing words, elegant expressions, of which in ordinary communications they might well deny the paternity. I noticed in the ‘Reply,’ that the affidavits, as they purport to be, have the stamp of the same hand on most of them; but this does not justify those who signed them in denying the paternity, because their own language is not used, after they have signed them and made oath to their truth. I do not recollect that Miss Reed censured Dr. Torsey in the conversation alluded to, but rather seemed to regret that the condition of the case and facts were such as to make him unavoidably subject to censure. When speaking of the prejudice against Louise, I asked her if it was known on the Hill that Dr. Torsey was prejudiced, to which she replied in the affirmative, and said it was unfortunate for him that it was known. I came to the conclusion, after the conversation with Miss Reed, that she did not hold that the Faculty or Dr. Torsey were culpable for or guilty of an intentional wrong, but for an unfortunate mistake, which resulted in a fatal wrong to Louise. When I remarked in substance that a serious or cruel wrong had been done Louise, Mr. Stillman A. Reed replied, ‘That is what *we* think.’ I inferred by that *we* he meant to include his sister, whose views, I suppose, he understood. If Miss Reed on reflection wishes to say that her first affidavit was false, and that she there uttered untruths, I cannot see the utility of your



wishing for affidavits to prove that she had uttered the same things in private conversation. As to her making the statement in the affidavit in your book, you need go no further than to her last affidavit in the 'Reply' for testimony to prove that she did make them. She says Mr. Greene said, 'This is a matter of great interest to us, and we wish to know all about this *simply for our own satisfaction.*' 'After this explanation from them, I proceeded to answer their questions *as well as I knew*; but they gave me no intimation that these *answers* would be printed or made public; nor did I ever *intend* or suppose that they would be, till after the publication of Greene's pamphlet' (p. 30 of Reply). It seems after the publication of your pamphlet She knew 'they' had been printed and made public. *They*—what? Why the very answers that she gave you, as she says, she supposed, for your 'own' personal and private '*satisfaction.*' She saw them in print; and knew them; and they were answers made 'as well as she knew.' From what she says about noticing that you were taking her answer in writing, and her hesitating about giving them in 'this form,' till after your explanation, I infer that these answers formed the basis of her affidavit, which, being arranged in form, she signed, and to which she made oath. I think this must be so, for these answers to which she alludes I believe appear in no other place in your pamphlet, except in her affidavit. She says you wrote her a letter asking questions about Louise and the manner of her leaving the Hill; but she says, 'By the advice of my friends at home I did not answer his letter, because I did not wish him to have any writing signed by me, I fearing that he might use it against the Institution at Kent's Hill.' Why did she hesitate to write, and give you simple and truthful answers? If she thought the truth was not against the Institution, why did she fear you would use her answers against it? She could scarcely use plainer language than she has in this part of her affidavit, to say or impress the idea that if she wrote you the truth it would be against the Institution, and you might thus use it. I am sorry that Miss Reed, by her attempt to retract from her former statement, finds herself placed before the public in so unenviable a position. It is true, both yourself and the authors of the 'Reply' have endorsed her moral worth, high standing, and veracity; but she can scarcely afford to be made the recipient of such puffs and fawning at the risk of public ridicule.

"After respectfully declining putting forth an affidavit in this matter, I will close this communication by saying that if you hav

been guilty of using undue influence and tearful entreaties, as she represents, to induce Miss Reed to swear to a falsehood, or if the parties interested at Kent's Hill have, by letters of persuasion, emissaries or attorneys sent to her, exercised a similar influence over her feelings, to obtain a retraction of her former statement, at the expense of her truthfulness and reputation, the guilty party ought to share the larger portion of public condemnation, rather than this unwary young lady, who doubtless would gladly have avoided any connection with the affair.

"Very respectfully yours,

"SUMNER R. NEWELL."

"PARIS, April 20, 1868.

"JONAS GREENE, Esq.,—Dear Sir,—After the exhibition of the extreme uncertainty of the truth of affidavits, as recently made in certain pamphlets now in circulation, I feel that public confidence must be shaken, and not much reliance placed on such productions. I must therefore decline making an affidavit of what I heard Miss M. I. Reed say, in the fall of 1866, concerning your daughter Louise leaving Kent's Hill, as you have requested. It would be difficult for me, after the time that has elapsed, to quote from recollection many of her expressions, or much of the language made use of at that time. I find by recent observation that when people undertake to give the statements of others, it is very safe to accuse them of falsehood, if they fail in giving the same language, although they convey the same idea. I well recollect that Miss Reed—in the fall of 1866, I think it was November—gave me, and others at the same time, a partial history of that affair. I do not think she went minutely into the matter, to tell all she knew about it; but talked freely, and answered all inquiries freely—not censuring or blaming any one. I have read her affidavit in your pamphlet, and I find many of the ideas therein were the same she advanced in the conversation to which I allude. I think she did not go into all the details in the matter at that time, as she did in her affidavit. She related the conversation with the stage-driver, Mr. H., very much as it appears in her affidavit; and she also spoke of her feelings, fears and wishes, and of her impatience at the delay, of the excitement on the Hill; and giving or conveying the same idea as one might gather by reading her affidavit; but I cannot say what the phraseology of her language was in giving expression to those ideas. I do not

recollect that she repeated or said anything about the conversation she had with Dr. Torsey; but *I do remember* that she said in substance that it was known on the Hill that he was prejudiced against Louise, and that it was unfortunate for him that it was known. If Miss Reed has made statements at variance with each other and with facts, to please you, or to shield and please any other party, I am sorry for her.

Yours, &c.,

S. P. GAMMON.

I, Robert G. Skofield, of Readfield, in the County of Kennebec, of lawful age, upon oath make affidavit and say, that on the 26th day of January, 1867, Mr. Jonas Greene, of Peru, and Miss Mira I. Reed, of Roxbury, came to my house at Kent's Hill. Mr. Greene came there from Augusta on the evening of the 25th, and stopped during the night. On the morning of the 26th he asked myself and wife if he could have a room, as he wished to have some conversation with Miss Reed in relation to his daughter Louise. We told him he could have a room as he desired; and about half past nine o'clock in the morning he went with his team to the Eaton House, near the College buildings, and about ten o'clock returned with Miss Reed. They stopped at my house to dinner, and were there some three hours or more. While there I heard no expression nor did I see any indication of haste on the part of either of them. They were in conversation together some two hours before dinner; but what their conversation was I do not know, as I was not in the room with them. They dined with myself and family, and remained some half an hour at my house after dinner. Mr. Greene informed me at this time that Miss Reed was going to the Corner with him, to make oath to a statement made by her in relation to his daughter Louise, and when they left they went in that direction.

ROBERT G. SKOFIELD.

STATE OF MAINE.—*Kennebec, ss.*—*April 24th, 1868.*—Then the above-named Robert G. Skofield personally appeared and made oath to the foregoing statement by him subscribed.

"Before me, EMERY O. BEAN, Justice of the Peace."

"I, Sybil M. Skofield, of Readfield, in the County of Kennebec, of lawful age, on oath depose and say, that Mr. Jonas Greene, of Peru, came to our house at Kent's Hill the night of the 25th of

January, 1867. That on the morning of the 26th of January he asked if he could have a room for the purpose of having some conversation with Miss Mira I. Reed, of Roxbury. Myself and husband, Robert G. Skofield, told him he could; and about half past nine o'clock that morning he went with his horse and sleigh to the Eaton House, about one half-mile from our place, and immediately returned with Miss Reed. He came into the house with her and introduced her to me. They remained until after dinner, and were there three hours or more. After they had been in the house a short time, Mr. Greene asked me for pen and ink. I told him the ink had been frozen, and was rather pale. He replied that it would answer his purpose. They occupied a room adjoining and opening into the one where I was, and I heard Mr. Greene and Miss Reed in conversation. I saw Mr. Greene writing at the table where he and Miss Reed sat, and he was reading from a written* paper and asking her questions. When I went into the room to ask them to dinner, they were near the table where he had been writing, and Miss Reed had a written paper in her hand which she appeared to be reading. Immediately after this Mr. Greene came into the room where the dinner table was set, and said we need not delay dinner for them; but we did wait some half an hour, and they then dined with myself and family. After dinner Mr. Greene went out of the house, and Miss Reed and myself went into the room adjoining the dining-room, where they had been before dinner. On the table was a written paper, which Miss Reed took and began to read. Soon after this, Mr. Greene came into the room and said to Miss Reed, 'Can you read it?' She replied, 'Yes; I thought I would look it over,' or 'read it over again.' I will not be positive whether she said 'look it over again,' or 'read it over it again.' It was one of these two expressions. I left the room soon after this, and when I left she was still reading this paper. They went from our house about half-an-hour after dinner. While Miss Reed was putting on her clothing to leave, I said to her I wished to send some apples to a friend of mine rooming at the same house with her. She replied that she was not then going back to the house, but was going to the Corner. Before dinner I heard Mr. Greene reading to Miss Reed from a written paper. This reading and the conversation between them I could have heard had I chosen to listen. His reading was not rapid, nor was the conversation between them in a low tone of voice. There were no expressions or acts on the part of Mr. Greene or Miss Reed

indicating any haste or any concealment of the purpose for which they were there.

SIBYL M. SKOFIELD."

STATE OF MAINE.—*Kennebec ss., April 24, 1868.*—Then the above-named Sibyl M. Skofield personally appeared and made oath to the truth of the foregoing statement, by her subscribed.

Before me, EMERY O. BEAN, *Justice of the Peace.*

READFIELD, April 24, 1868.

HON. J. GREENE, — Dear Sir, — In reply to your inquiry, I will say, when you and Miss Reed came to my office, the 26th of January, 1867, you were both entire strangers to me, and I had no knowledge of the contents of the paper signed and sworn to by Miss Reed. Immediately after you came into the office, you said to me you wished me to administer an oath to the young lady, remarking that you supposed it was not necessary for me to know the contents of the affidavit. I replied it was not. You then handed me a written statement, signed by Mira I. Reed. I thereupon asked Miss Reed if she signed the paper which I held in my hand. Her reply was—"I did." I further asked her if she knew its contents. She said she did. I then administered the oath—made a certificate thereof on the paper signed by her, and passed the same to you.

Very respectfully yours,

EMERY O. BEAN.

WINTHROP, April 20, 1868.

HON. JONAS GREENE,—A lady of truthful and religious character, states that last summer, before your "Crown Won" was published, Mira I. Reed, of Roxbury, in repeated conversations, fully committed herself to her affidavit as it afterwards appeared in your pamphlet; so that, upon reading it, she remarked upon the perfect agreement between her certified and oral statement. This lady declines certifying in the case, from personal and private considerations, which may be appreciated by the public.

You may use this statement as you may deem proper, omitting to notice any other facts in the case of which you may have knowledge.

M. B. SEARS.

I, Willoby R. Knapp, of the town of Byron, being of lawful age, do depose and say that, on or about the last of October, 1867, I called at Stillman A. Reed's, in the town of Roxbury, and there saw

Mira I. Reed, who had previously told me that she wanted one of the pamphlets, "Crown Won." Said she wanted to see if the affidavit of her's in the book was correct. She said if what she had been told was in the affidavit in the book it was not correct. I told her that I had some of the pamphlets, and if she wanted one, I would send one down to her. She then told me that she had borrowed the book and read it. I said, how did you find your statement? She replied, "about as I expected." (She finding no fault.)

W. R. KNAPP.

February 9, 1868.

Oxford, ss. — March 9, 1868. — Personally appeared the above named Wm R. Knapp, and made oath that the above statement by him subscribed is true.

Before me,

WM. WOODSUM, Jr., Trial Justice.

By all I have shown, it does not appear that Miss Reed had much reason to complain of me, or that she was dissatisfied with her affidavit in the "Crown Won" to any great extent, up to the middle of November, 1867. Why and by what means she was then induced to write Dr. Torsey and say that she would write me about her giving me that affidavit, and said the answer she received she would send to him.

It may not be known to Miss R. that her letter to Dr. T. was read publicly by Benj. W. Harriman, in the Post-office, November 27, 1867, on Kent's Hill.

In accordance with this promise which she gave Dr. T., I suppose I received the following letter from her :

"ROXBURY, ME., Nov. 18, 1867.

"MR. GREENE,—When I gave you my statement, which I find published in your book, you spoke of putting it in better language ; and are you sure, in so doing, you have given all the facts as they are in the original ?

"Please give me an answer by return mail.

"Yours in haste,

"MIRA I. REED."

To this letter I immediately replied, in substance,—Miss Reed : At the time you gave me your affidavit or statement, when I spoke of putting it in better shape, I meant it should have been done, if at

all, before you signed and made oath to it. It is copied word for word into my book, as given and read by you, as the original will show; and on your seeing the same you will be satisfied.

Although there seems to have been some plotting—which was then unknown to me—between them, to see if they could not implicate me in some wrong, they seem to be caught in their own trap. Whether my answer was sent to Dr. T. or not, I am not informed, and there is no reference made to it in the “Reply.”

With all I have shown and proved in regard to Miss Bowers, Miss Reed and Miss Hunton's charges and statements against me, I am content for the public to judge, why and how they were obtained, and who are most to blame—these young ladies or those older and more wicked heads, who, I believe, have assisted them.

Whether all that which purports to be affidavits in the Reply, are really so or not, I do not know, but there must be some design in withholding the locality and dates, the names of the authors and the signatures of magistrates. Was it because they did not want me and the public to know who are the persons—whether members of this Faculty, lawyers or ministers, that have itinerated round, coaxed and worked up those over-strained statements and affidavits? But I do know that one D. G. Harriman—who was at the time Louise left, one of this Faculty, but now he is practising law in Portland—was known to be at Dixfield on the first of December, 1867, where he declared he was on his way to Roxbury to see Mira I. Reed, from whom he was going to try to get an affidavit to off-set the one that was in Mr. Greene's book, and that he arrived at her residence in Roxbury and there remained some length of time, out of which grew this wonderful affidavit, of which in the first part she declared she signed the affidavit in the “Crown Won,” and in closing she says—“The foregoing statements have been made of my own free will, and without solicitation, *prompted* simply by a sense of duty.”

The reader will notice in her letter to me of November, 18, 1867, after she found her statement published, she does not complain that she finds more statement published than she gave me, or that they were too strong; but says—“Are you sure, in so doing, you have given all the facts as they are in the original?”

This committee have said, “we have carefully avoided any statement injurious to the reputation of the deceased, etc.”

What was the object of parading the testimony of Miss Church before the public, when the subject matter of that testimony has been

publicly admitted and never denied? The only thing that has been gained by it, is a refutation of Miss Case's false insinuation respecting the key and an expose of her willingness to shield the living at the expense of the character of the dead.

When the Trustees sent D. G. Harriman to try to get Miss Read to recant or deny her sworn statement in the "Crown Won," they knew that by so doing they should injure her character and standing if they succeeded. But what care they who they injure, if they can save their Faculty? They wished to destroy her testimony, hence their writing and fawning around her.

Some of my readers may ask who is this J. W. H., or J. W. Hathaway, whose name for the past year frequently appeared in various Journals of this State, under different little puffs in favor of the Maine Wesleyan Seminary and College, and in favor of Dr. T. and the management of that school, with squibs against me and my book, asking the reader of the "Crown Won," to suspend their judgment, etc., until a counter statement can be made. He is a paid agent and one of their ministers who is travelling the State, begging for and extolling that institution. This same Reverend gentleman petitioned and hung round the last Legislature to get through a resolve in aid of the same. He failed in that effort, but got it referred to the next Legislature, when he or some agent for them, will try to push a resolve through, which will take six or seven thousand dollars out of the State. I ask no suspension of opinion of what that Faculty or Trustees have or may publish in this sad case. But I do desire that all who have read the Reply, and all who wish to know anything about this case, to read the Rejoinder and the Crown Won, and then form your own opinion, only asking yourselves this question: If this was your child or friend, instead of mine, how would the whole matter look to you; and what less would you have said than I have?

This committee make a grave charge against me, (because I make an effort to put my version of this heart-rending affair before the public, and say, in the Crown Won, "It is my object to circulate the same as extensively as possible,) and insinuate that my object is not to vindicate the reputation of my daughter, but my real object was to make money. They understand how such insinuations will take with some people. After spending fifteen hundred dollars in consequence of sending my daughter to that Seminary, and about five hundred more in search to find our lost and heart-broken girl, I did

not feel able to publish, and pay all the expenses of distributing so expensive a pamphlet (which contains more than double the amount of reading than their reply,) free. But this Rejoinder, a pamphlet of 64 pages, I will send by mail, postage prepaid, to all who desire a copy, on the receipt of fifteen cents.

On receipt of fifty cents, a copy of the Rejoinder and Crown Won will be sent with postage paid anywhere in the U. S. And for the information of those who think I am making money in publishing and distributing the Crown Won, I will give them the amount of my outlay and income on the account of the publication and sale of said pamphlet.

Paid for printing the "Crown Won,"	\$1,115 00
(For which I have their receipt.)	
Received for the sale of the "Crown Won,"	\$502 00
I have on hand, and in agents' hands, books	\$263 00
to the amount of about	<hr/> 765 00

Loss, if the books all sell,	\$350 00
------------------------------	----------

This denomination, through their circuit preachers, have been pushing the sales of this scandalous Reply in all directions to force upon the public the *four thousand* copies which they have printed, and to make the public believe that I and my family are unworthy of belief, and not fit to live outside of the State prison. The preacher on this charge has pretended great sympathy for us in our affliction, yet he has carried round and sold this wicked and contemptible Reply to our neighbors and townsmen. A reply which denounces all I have proved and shown as false. It's theme is in substance, you lie; your statements are false. You lie; your statements are false from beginning to end. While this committee would make you believe that they and all who dealt with our child were perfect patterns to follow—full of truth, justice, love, mercy, humanity and morality: free from sin, infallible, not liable to err or make any mistake. Perfect saints. If all they say is credited, who will wonder to see our pew vacant when men of that denomination fill the pulpit? I appeal to every honest reader of their Reply to say how much of the teachings of Christ is exhibited towards me or my family in the same; or by the Faculty in their whole transaction with my child, her parents and friends.

Since my Rejoinder was nearly all in type I received a letter, from which I extract the following:



"I got on board the stage at the post-office. I was on the platform, and in the office, while the mail was being changed. * * * *
 * * * * I noticed Miss Greene, and that she was or had been crying. * * I noticed that she made no conversation, except to answer direct questions. I noticed her in the depot while waiting for the train. I supposed that she had met with some calamity, but never thought of there being any trouble in the school, as I always heard her spoken of as an exemplary young lady. * * * I *emphatically* say she showed signs in her face when I first saw her of *recent tears*."

Here comes out a true statement of our poor child's appearance and feelings when leaving the scene of her trouble. I think her accuser, and those who testify to her unfeeling appearance on the day she left the Hill, will on their death bed have something to regret and think of before they pass to meet Louise in the other world. A trader in Readfield states that a friend confidentially told him that he heard Benj. W. Harriman say that Louise Greene was much affected and wept while on the route from Kent's Hill to the depot. He (Harriman) believed she would not return to her father's, but would wander. Compare this statement with his in the Reply, and you will see what they can do at the Hill.

A gentleman in Readfield, of position and note, will state on oath in any court of law, that Anson P. Morrill, about one week after the sad affair at Kent's Hill, said, "This Louise Greene affair is the most damning thing that ever happened in this vicinity; and if she was a daughter of mine I would follow it as long as I had a cent left." Here come out the honest sentiments of his and every parent's heart.

Another gentleman in Readfield told me in November, 1866, that Gov. A. P. Morrill said, soon after Louise's remains were found, that he should rather be in Louise Greene's place than Dr. Torsey's.

He also talked very friendly to me on the 26th day of January, 1867, at his house, where he had invited me to make a call. He then showed much sympathy for our great loss. Why has he lent his name and influence to try to crush, disgrace and break me and my family down, as he has in the Reply? Are not our troubles hard enough? If this case was reversed between us, he could but see and feel as I do.